

Georgia Southern University Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

2016

Faculty Senate Minutes-2016

Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Georgia Southern University, "Faculty Senate Minutes-2016" (2016). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 39.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/39>

This minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

**Faculty Senate Minutes
February 15, 2016
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Russell Union Ballroom**

Voting Members in Attendance: Cheryl Aasheim, Sam Adeyeye, Ashley Colquitt for Moya Alfonso, Olga Amarie, Kelly Berry, Chad Posick for Sarah Bielski, Adam Bossler, Sally Ann Brown, Gavin Colquitt, Finbarr Curtis, Marc Cyr, John Dyer, Mark Edwards, Tom Pearsall for Larisa Elisha, Richard Flynn, Alice Hall, Ellen Hamilton, Jim Harris, Ming Fang He, Jonathan Hilpert, Patricia Humphrey, Alina Jacob, Scott Kersey, Barbara King, Shainaz Landge, Li Li, Jim LoBue, Nan LoBue, Ron MacKinnon, Alan Mackelprang, Jessica Minihan, Lowell Mooney, Marla Morris, Shahnam Navaee, Constantin Ogloblin, Enka Lakuriqi for Marshall Ransom, Joe Ruhland, Lina Soares, Linda L. Thompson, Mark Welford, Tharanga Wickramarachchi

Voting Members Not in Attendance: Lisa Abbott, Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, William Amponsah, Steven Elisha, Tim Giles, Mujibur Khan, Lili Li, Lawrence Locker, Li Ma, Santanu Majumdar, Leticia McGrath, Bryan Miller, Jake Simons, Valentin Soloiu, Jim Stephens, Tiffanie Townsend, Jianqiang Zhao

Commented [1]: Ming Fang He (COE): There was one mistake. Li Ma was here, but they listed that she was absent.

Li Ma (COSM): I did not sign, sorry.

Administrators: Jean Bartels, Diana Cone, Steven Burrell, Teresa Thompson, Rob Whitaker, Martha Abell, Alan Amason, Greg Evans, Devon Jensen, Christine Ludowise for Curtis Ricker

Senate Parliamentarian: Karen McCurdy

Student Government Association: Erroll Spence

NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman

Visitors: Dustin Anderson, Candace Griffith, Maura Copeland, Amber Culpepper, Andrea Hagans, Megan Stewart, Steven Harper, Delena Bell Gatch, Trent Maurer, KeShawn Harris, Yi Hu, Alisa Leckie, Meca Williams-Johnson

SECRETARY'S NOTE: Once again, the recording of the meeting was flawed. Some periods or individual speakers are garbled or inaudible. Also, because I gave up my known-to-be-working microphone to some speakers, and so was standing and therefore not able to take notes, there are some gaps in my notes.

Approval of the Agenda for the February 15, 2016 meeting.

Moved and Approved.

Approval of the November 16, 2015 Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary.

Moved and Approved.

Librarian's Reports for February 2016: Jessica Minihan (LIB) Senate Librarian:

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that he had privately asked NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative Chris Geyerman some general questions pertaining to our football budget that were prompted by a *Chronicle of Higher Education* article. He asked if Geyerman could comment on the budget numbers re: Georgia Southern that the *Chronicle* published.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) said he'd be happy to pursue answers to any specific questions if Cyr would submit them in an RFI, but that he was not qualified to comment on the Athletic Department budget.

Cyr said he would send in some questions, and noted his concern was that the move to Bowl Division had increased student fees to something like \$5.8 million, a huge increase over the previous year, while revenue had not gone up anywhere near enough to offset those fee increases. He wondered how we are justifying the larger expenditure from what we were paying previously.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee noted that in November she had been handed a letter addressed to the Faculty Senate President, which was totally anonymous, inquiring about the athletic budget and more specifically the football budget. She mentioned or showed it to several other people on the SEC and their sentiment was that we don't address totally anonymous things.

The Librarian's Report was Approved as accurate.

Undergraduate Committee Report — Cheryl Aasheim (CEIT), Chair:

On November 10, they approved five new courses; deleted a course; had 56 course revisions, which led to 14 program revisions; had three program deletions due to low enrollment; one program minor became a certificate; and there were ten special topic announcements. These minutes were Approved.

In January they approved 26 new courses; 14 were deleted; three courses were reactivated; four selected topics were announced; and 82 courses were revised, leading to 35 program revisions; one program was deleted in Public Health and two new programs announced, a Public Health minor and a Gerontology Interdisciplinary minor. These minutes were Approved.

Graduate Committee Report — Dustin Anderson (CLASS), Chair:

Anderson noted that they had vetted over 600 pages of material in their last two meetings. In November, they approved 16 new courses in three colleges; approved revising eight courses in three colleges; approved deleting 12 courses in two colleges; approved two program revisions in two colleges; and approved one new program in Public Health as well. They also discussed a proposal to the Graduate Faculty Status Policy that was tabled during that meeting; the Director of Student Services from COGS introduced an issue surrounding Graduate Credit Hour Requirements during the final phase of a graduate student's candidacy; and they looked at some proposed dissertation design changes on which the Interim Associate Dean of the College of Graduate Studies is seeking feedback. These minutes were Approved.

In January, they approved 21 new courses in six colleges; the reactivation of two courses within our Nursing program; the revision of 29 courses over four colleges; the deletion of one course; eight program revisions in five different colleges; the deletion of three programs or certificates in two colleges; and three new programs or certificates in two colleges. They also introduced upcoming program reviews, which committee members are undertaking now. These minutes were Approved.

General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Report:

There was no one present to report. However, Jim Harris (CEIT) noted that he is on the committee and is watching faculty struggle with these reviews because they're not really trained in assessment. He wondered why faculty are doing these reviews when we have an Office of Assessment, with experts in assessment.

President Jean Bartels noted that the responsibility for the assessment of any course in the curriculum is the responsibility of faculty, not the office of Institutional Effectiveness. We have had numerous training opportunities on assessment for faculty for many years now.

Harris said his problem is that everything this committee does deals with process, and not product; they are just making sure that faculty are following the correct process, and he didn't think that is stated as something the faculty should be doing. He is evaluating programs he knows nothing about. If you want to evaluate product, you have to have people expert in those specific disciplines. But this committee is not expert in process and that is what they're assessing.

Moderator Humphrey noted that she is comfortable assessing programs in her field. Harris agreed, but when he is thrown into a discipline he knows nothing about, he feels very uncomfortable. Humphrey suggested that we ask Terri Flateby to come to Senate and address this for us. Harris agreed.

Humphrey mentioned the gratitude owed to people who serve on all our committees who show up for meetings and work diligently, this leading to a note that we are coming up on election season and that if faculty can't make the set meeting times for these curriculum committees, they should not run for election to them because meeting attendance is absolutely essential to those committees functioning. Graduate Committee meets the first Thursday of every month at 9:30 and Undergraduate the first Tuesday at 3:30. Undergraduate Chair Aasheim confirmed the importance of this and noted they've had some major problems as the result of people being late or just not coming to meetings.

President's Report (Jean Bartels):

SACSCOC Reaccreditation

We now have the final full approval thru the year 2025, with zero recommendations for alterations on that report. One of the things that is going to be critically important for us is to remember that the SACSCOC Reaffirmation process is not the only thing that is important in terms of what we do re: Assessment. That is not something we just did for SACS, but something that is important to the ongoing development not only of our curriculum for every program, and for every student, but also what happens in terms of expectations for improving our programs and units. So we will be continuing that very important work. Obviously we are going to do some things around core curriculum. There has been confusion with core curriculum for a long time in terms of the mandates we have from the University System, the revisions that got done, and she was not sure exactly what the Gen Ed committee is being asked to review. She wants to look into that, because if it's process, that's one thing, but outcomes are important, and those need to be assessed as well, and by people that are in the discipline.

President's Assessment Advisory Team

In line with that, President Bartels said she has created a President's Assessment Advisory Team, which is representative of every single college and all units in the institution, to continue to explore what's happening with assessment in everybody's units.

Budget

We presented our budget request to the University System. Because we had a student enrollment that was flat, we don't anticipate much additional money to come using the current formula. However, the Governor did recommend full funding of a 3% merit increase for faculty and staff for the institution. That would go to the USG Board of Regents and they are the group that actually distributes that resource. It is fully funded, which it wasn't the last time around, so hopefully we will see an actual 3% coming to the institution. Also, we expressed our need to look at compression, and asked for some additional resources for that. We also talked about some of the emergent programs that need support and development. Overall, ours was a relatively small budget request, as we were encouraged to do because of flat enrollments.

Legislation

Once again, campus carry is being discussed in the legislature, this time with the addition of tasers. The USG continues to support very strongly the current law which bans all of those things from campus. President Bartels noted that faculty members are free to provide their perspectives as private citizens, but they cannot represent their positions as representing Georgia Southern or the USG.

New Buildings on Campus

The Military Science Building is beginning construction, and that's located off of 301 right where the roundabout is that gets you onto campus on that road. In January, we had a ribbon cutting for the Student Health Services Building. The multipurpose building is in its design phase, and has now come down to three versions of a draft design for that building.

Presidential Search

Airport interviewing for potential candidates was happening in Atlanta later in the week. On Campus interviews, at this point in time, for the finalists that are identified, are scheduled for the weeks of February 29 and March 7. The committee is supposed to recommend to the Board of Regents its unsequenced and unranked recommendations by March 11, and the Board of Regents in mid-March will interview those final candidates and make the decision for the end of that presidential search.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) asked if it is legal for faculty members who want to speak or write on the campus carry bill to identify themselves as faculty members at Georgia Southern. President Bartels said that "as soon as you do that you identify Georgia Southern, so I would request or I would think that what would be requested would be that you identify yourself as a faculty of a public institution in the System or in a public institution in the state. They will know you come from USG then, but at least you're not identifying necessarily what your affiliation is."

Lowell Mooney (COBA) asked how our enrollment numbers compared with those of other schools. President Bartels said a number of institutions lost enrollments, but in general they were pretty level across the System, and a few places went up. VP Teresa Thompson (Student Affairs and Enrollment Management) confirmed this and added that those schools with increases saw them largely due to mini-mesters. President Bartels added that we are "commendable" because our FTE is third only to UGA and Georgia College and State, at 83% FTE; other schools have many part-time students. Also, our student credit hours are up again.

(Ming Fang He of COE posed a question that is inaudible on the tape, but that asked President Bartels for information about pay increases that she had already given in her report.)

President Bartels replied, "Let me repeat what I said for you. In the budget this year, yet unapproved, at the state level, the Governor has recommended full-funding for a 3% merit increase, that would impact everybody in the System. Again it's merit based, as they always are. There is nothing in the budget for compression. We have noted in our budget request that compression continues to be an issue for us, and would request some assistance with that. There is no money that came in the legislative language for compression. I know that's your favorite question."

Richard Flynn (CLASS) asked if there was somewhere a roster of members on the Assessment Advisory team. President Bartels said she would make that public, and that the members came from every college and from every vice president in the institution.

Mark Edwards (COSM) noted that "Just because the Governor suggests 3%, and even if it's approved by the legislature, it doesn't mean that Georgia Southern will necessarily get 3% because it has to be also apportioned by the Board of Regents. Is that true?" President Bartels confirmed this, but anticipated that this time around it probably will be at that amount.

Moderator Humphrey noted an error in the agenda: Provost Diana Cone could not give her report because, though present, she can hardly speak due to illness.

Senate Executive Committee Report: (Pat Humphrey [COSM], Chair.):

We had no Motion requests, but two RFIs: One from Karl Peace asked about the place of publishing books at Georgia Southern these days. In Dr. Grube's day the Spring Faculty Meeting honored people who had published books in the previous year. According to Dr. Bartels, there are a couple of problems with that: 1) Lack of clarity re: what constitutes a book as opposed to say a manual, as opposed to say a book chapter. 2) People in Performance and Creative Arts tended to be left out of the honors. Currently, though, people who do publish books are honored by the Library and at the Alumni Building, and the Alumni Magazine recently had an article in terms of new books published. The RFI question was unclear, but may also have been asking how books count towards promotion/tenure, but that might be dependent on specific disciplines, so if that's the question it needs to be clarified and resubmitted.

Another RFI from John Dyer was re: attendance verification in online classes, which can sometimes be problematic. Various professors have various methods and deadlines, and so the situation is rather chaotic. Dyer wanted to know if there was a better way.

Barbara King (CLASS) asked if we have a recommendation for the time frame for online attendance verification. Moderator Humphrey noted that it is supposed to be the same as in a regular course. King, though, noted that online classes don't have a particular meeting day, and asked if we are supposed to do it the first day, second day, by the third day, or what. Moderator Humphrey noted her own practice re: deadlines, but Adam Bossler (CLASS) noted that this was what King was talking about – each professor having different practices, which is very confusing especially since students might be taking multiple online courses in any given semester. He thought a more straightforward policy as to when students are expected to do attendance verification would help students probably even more than the faculty. Humphrey noted that this was something to pursue with the Registrar.

Presidential Search Update (Pat Humphrey):

Moderator Humphrey reiterated, with a few extra details, what President Bartels had already said, but then emphasized the confidential nature of the process until the names of those candidates coming to campus are announced. She and other search committee members have been doing a lot of background searching on the candidates.

Ming Fang He (COE): *(After identifying herself, her question is inaudible on the tape.)*

Moderator Humphrey replied, “No, Ming Fang, it was not because, for one thing, it was not celebrating just work. It was only celebrating books. If you published 20 articles you were not celebrated at that particular event. So that again is part of why I think why Dr. Bartels, at least, believes the thing was discontinued in its prior form.”

Richard Flynn (CLASS) asked if there was a possibility of resurrecting such an event in a more inclusive form because, for one thing, he thought it might bring people to the Spring faculty meeting.

President Bartels said she'd like to have a more inclusive way to celebrate the great scholarly and creative work that's done. One thing we're already trying to do is make that more public in other publications, such as the President's Newsletter and in the University Newsletters and things like that.

Moderator Humphrey then noted that the next item, an update from our Student Opinions of Instruction Ad Hoc Committee, was intended as an information only item, “. . . so if people start wanting to get into nitpicking and editing on the fly . . . I’m planning on shutting you down very quickly.”

Richard Flynn (CLASS) asked if the instrument had been released so that people could look at it, and if not, would we get a look at it before the start the pilot. Moderator Humphrey suggested that question be left pending the update.

Student Opinions of Instruction Ad-Hoc Committee Update — Trent Maurer, CHHS:

Trent Maurer (CHHS) said no, nobody would get to look at them because the committee was appointed to use their expertise and if they opened it up for everyone else to look at it, it would derail them. The initial plan was for a pilot testing in December of ‘15. It took so long to hear back from the companies that sell these things, and ultimately to eliminate them, that they’re now a semester behind.

In 2013-14 a different committee formed to examine the then ten-year-old SRI, nearly all the faculty and administrators who commented said we want a new form. This current committee was formed in Spring 2015 and charged to explore different options, whether it be for purchase or creation of a new measure; to pilot a new SRI and, if successful, recommend that to the Senate for approval. In addition, they were charged to develop new guidelines for the use of the SRI form.

This semester they completely eliminated purchase because there are only two options, and neither looked good. So they have developed our own form from a combination of best practices in the literature of over 1,500 peer reviewed studies on SRI’s, and two measures they were given explicit permission to use. We think we are going to have a really good measure when it gets pilot tested. They are near to having the information they require to draw a stratified random sample, and now need information re: our transition to new ScanTron machines because they want any new SRI to work with those. He commended Pam Deal, Sonya Chance and Sarah McNure for their help.

They should soon begin notifying department chairs and faculty that they have been randomly selected to participate in the pilot testing. From that point, they will rely on

the good faith of faculty and department chairs to comply. He invited the Provost to issue a directive to faculty to comply because he can't compel cooperation.

Moderator Humphrey asked Maurer to give us some idea of how what they have come up with is more formative, which is what the BOR policy calls for, than summative, which is what our current SRI looks like.

Maurer said we are lucky that the BOR has required that SRI's focus on the improvement of teaching, even though it's under the evaluation aegis, so the form really needs to focus more on student learning. Like the existing SRI, there will be a section on the teacher on the pilot form, a section on the course, and a section for open ended comments, though the way these look and the way they work may be a little bit different. But there will be a new section on the student in which the student will report their own behavior as connected to learning, such as to what extent they actually come to class. They also are trying to add in the student learning objectives for the course. They want students to actively reflect on their learning, on what a professor did (or did not) do that helped their learning, rather on whether or not they like a particular professor.

Mark Edwards (COSM) said he hadn't anything from Maurer about soliciting the opinion of the faculty.

Maurer figures to hear complaints from faculty involved in the pilot even before he solicits comments. After the pilot, they plan to solicit comment from faculty and chairs involved in the pilot. He said they "also realize that change is everyone's favorite word, so we expect to get a lot of negative feedback no matter what we do, and the challenges of course [will be in] interpreting that in light of what the literature says, in light of what the best practices are." The form as it's designed now will be more complicated to use, because you will not be able to summarize a faculty member's teaching with a single number, which he calls a good thing.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) asked about the ultimate process for approval or disapproval of this instrument, wanting to know when it will come to a vote in the Senate.

Maurer said that after gathering and analyzing the pilot data, ideally they will come back for the first Senate meeting Fall semester and recommend the form for adoption at that time. He did not think it realistic to recommend it in the summer because of the amount of data they'll have to go through.

Moderator Humphrey asked how many classes/courses they envision using for this pilot testing. Maurer couldn't be exact because of the remaining logistical question of who will and who will not have the new ScanTron machines. Humphrey asked for an approximation – 20 classes? 100? Maurer said the University has approximately 2350 classes in which SRI's would be used this semester, and using standard statistical power tests they need about 330 for a representative sample, but that they would be unable to get anywhere near that, that is just too unwieldy, they can't make it work. He figured they'd get in the neighborhood of about half of that, if they get a good answer to that logistical question. If they don't, it may become a moot point and they may have a much smaller population from which to draw.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) asked whether they will ensure disciplinary diversity for the pilot because he was worried about who won't get represented in the pilot.

Maurer said the very reason they are waiting for that logistical information is so they can take a stratified random sample that will come from every single college, both graduate and undergraduate, both face-to-face and online, and classes of a wide variety of sizes. They want to ensure no one is left out. That doesn't mean every department is going to be selected; that's not the way stratified random works.

Flynn remained worried, though, because Maurer had said they won't have a statistically significant sample.

(Secretary's Note: I apologize for the lengthy direct quotations that now follow, but your humble Secretary doesn't know what a lot of this means, though it seems others on the Senate do.)

Maurer replied, "The fun thing about that is the issue when you are asking is the power sufficient to be reasonably certain. The question is, are the means that you find representative of the means from the population. The old form was very much focused on SRI means. The last committee made it very clear that that's an inappropriate way to evaluate faculty. The new forms, although means are possible to calculate, are not what everything is going to be about. The new forms are going to be about distributions, which is much less of an issue; we are much more interested in the frequency distribution of responses than the mean." Moderator Humphrey agreed with that.

Alan Mackelprang (COBA) asked what sort of criteria would indicate a successful pilot test.

Maurer replied, “Several of the questions will ask things like how much time do students on average report studying for a class? We already have data from NSSE on that, so we will be able to compare the distribution of responses to what we have from NSSE. If they are at least somewhat similar, that’s a pretty good representation. If this pilot test comes back such that, you know, 90% of our students say they are putting in 12 hours a week for each class, well, we know that’s not true. So we have questions like that in there where we can triangulate with other data sources to know whether or not this is representative. Similarly we will want to expect a certain degree of variability on the responses, so no matter what question we are looking at, we don’t have answer responses that are all at one end of the spectrum or the other, but there is some diversity. We would expect some frequency distribution so it’s not all lined up on one, but honestly a significant part of what will determine the effectiveness is does this blow up and create any problems? Because there is no way to know that until we pilot test it because it is so different from some of the things we’ve done before. We are looking at also to identify kinks in administration of it because we don’t want to have that happen during a wide scale implementation.”

Mark Edwards (COSM) asked how, assuming that this new form is implemented, would an average faculty member represent his/her performance because almost all departments use SRI as some component of evaluation.

Maurer said it would be “not terribly dissimilar to the way it is now, but instead of the tyranny of the mean which we know is problematic on our current form, they would simply report the frequency distribution instead. The idea here is that rather than saying I have a mean of x out of a score of y, you instead say on these questions this is the distribution of my student responses. It gives a somewhat more holistic picture of what’s going on. It also is really interesting because you have faculty members, most of whom teach more than one course. And so they can say in course x, here is the distribution, but in course y this is the distribution, and here’s what I think is going on pedagogically with that, and here’s what I’ve chosen to do to try to address those differences.”

Edwards asked, “So you mean it’s something like giving the mean of standard deviation of a normal distribution or something like that?”

Maurer replied, “No, that’s not what would happen at all. They would avoid the mean and the standard deviation; they would say of this six point scale, for example, x% had one, y% had two, z% had 3, and this was the distribution, and you’d look at that

distribution. I actually think this will be much more helpful to faculty members especially those going up for promotion/tenure. Because the mean may not change over a five-year period, but the distribution of responses could. You could have a faculty member who has a lot of scores on the one/five range with a mean of three at year one, but by year five their means are three. Statistically those means could turn out the same, but that tells us something qualitatively different about that faculty member. Similarly, there might be a small mean change which right now we could detect as a small mean change, but if what's happening is that in years one and two we had a certain population of students who rated the faculty member very low on a few items, but then by years three, four, and five those ones turn into threes or fours, that tells us more than there's a mean change of .2 on a five point scale."

Edwards noted that we already have these statistics on the current form.

Maurer agreed, but they are not typically reported that way. There seems to be a focus on the mean and many of the questions on the existing form are not appropriate, and so we need to change the questions themselves. It is not just what the data says; it's that the questions are problematic.

Moderator Humphrey noted "that we are dealing with ordinal data, and calculating means and standard deviations in small classes with ordinal data as totally inappropriate."

Flynn noted that Maurer was saying that it's the questions that are the problem, yet he and the committee were not letting us know what any of the questions are, which Flynn found disturbing. He also noted that Maurer had said the committee was going to make recommendations for the way these evaluations should be used, and he wanted more information about that part of the committee's work.

Maurer replied that much of this comes from the 2013-14 committee, which recommended some changes, and the work of the Faculty Welfare Committee, which instituted some but not all of those changes, so when the current ad-hoc committee was charged, they were sure that making those changes was part of their official charge. He offered as an example getting rid of the practice of administrators using means to compare individual faculty members. He also referred to what Moderator Humphrey had said about best practices in basic math. He reiterated, though, that the committee was "not going to show you the questions. The committee was deliberately composed of

experts on SRI's, people who are familiar with the existing literature, because the issues are exceptionally complex. In addition to good pedagogy and issues in evaluation, there are many logistical issues we have to deal with, too, like we don't want more than a two-page form because then you need a staple, and if you have a staple then you can't use the existing software and hardware machines we are trying to make it work with. All these different things are going on and at this point it would completely derail our work to reopen it up."

Flynn asked at-large whether an open records request would be the proper way to see these questions. Moderator Humphrey suggested he talk with Maurer one-on-one. Maurer said that would be fine.

Ellen Hamilton (CHHS) understood Flynn's concern about not having seen the questions, but noted Maurer had said that once they have run the pilot, we will have the opportunity to see the information, and so a pilot is just that, a pilot to see what roadblocks we meet and where we need to change our direction. She suggested that the Senate wait to see what the pilot results are and move forward from there.

Jim LoBue (COSM) noted that Maurer said this was a more complicated instrument, and asked if Maurer had a sense of how much longer it's going to take to administer.

Maurer said they don't want a form that's going to take 30 minutes, so "no matter what" they want to keep it to front and back of a single piece of paper. They kept most of the questions quantitatively oriented, so there still are only two open-ended questions. He anticipated no increase in time, and maybe less time because there are fewer questions.

Moderator Humphrey noted that because Dr. Bartels has to go to a meeting in Atlanta next month, the Senate meeting that was scheduled for March 8, has been moved to March 7 and over to the Nessmith-Lane building.

Unfinished Business

None.

New Business

None.

Announcements: Vice Presidents

None.

Announcements from the Floor

None

Adjournment

Moved and Approved.

3-23-2016

3-23-2016 Faculty Senate Minutes

Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Georgia Southern University, "3-23-2016 Faculty Senate Minutes" (2016). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 16.
<http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/16>

This minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Faculty Senate Minutes
March 23, 2016
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
****Nessmith-Lane Ballroom****

Voting members in Attendance: Cheryl Aasheim, Lisa Abbott, Samuel Adeyeye, Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, Hani Samawi for Moya Alfonso, Olga Amarie, William Amponsah, Kelly Berry, Chad Posick for Sarah Bielski, Sally Ann Brown, Finbarr Curtis, Jennifer Kowalewski for Marc Cyr, Steven Elisha, Larisa Elisha, Richard Flynn, Leigh Ann Williams for Tim Giles, Marian Tabi for Alice Hall, Ellen Hamilton, Jim Harris, Ming Fang He, Jonathan Hilpert, Yi Hu, Alina Iacob, Barbara King, Shainaz Landge, Alisa Leckie, Li Li, Jim LoBue, Nan LoBue, Lawrence Locker, Ron MacKinnon, Chung-Yean Chian for Alan Mackelprang, Santanu Majumdar, Leticia McGrath, Jessica Minihan, Lowell Mooney, Shahnam Navaee, Constantin Ogloblin, Marshall Ransom, Jim Stephens, Mark Welford, Tharanga Wickramarachchi,

Senate Moderator and Chair Senate Executive Committee: Patricia Humphrey

Parliamentarian: Karen McCurdy

Student Government Association: Errol Spence

Voting members not in Attendance: Adam Bossler, Gavin Colquitt, John Dyer, Mark Edwards, Scott Kersey, Mujibur Kahn, Lili Li, Li Ma, Bryan Miller, Joe Ruhland, Jake Simons, Lina Soares, Valentin Soloiu, Tiffanie Townsend

Administrators: Jean Bartels, Rob Whitaker, Martha Abell, Barry Joyner, Thomas Koballa, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker, Devon Jensen

Visitors: David Dylan John, Cathy Beene, Janet Dale, Dustin Anderson, Beth Durodoye, Christine Ludowise, Candace Griffith, Leah Edwards, Jose E. Londen, Anna Battestello, D. Jason Slone, Barry Balleck, Michael Murphy, Breanna Jones, Brenda Blackwell, Robert Farber, LaRodrick Harris, Meca Williams-Johnson (*Some visitors' names were illegible.*)

Approval of the Agenda for the March 23, 2016 meeting.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee: The agenda was moved, seconded, and approved. Lisa Abbott (CLASS) asked to amend the agenda to add a resolution regarding House Bill 859, to be discussed and voted on. Parliamentarian Karen McCurdy said this was Moderator Humphrey's call. Humphrey moved the amended agenda, it was seconded, and approved with this resolution becoming agenda item #9.

Moderator Humphrey noted that Secretary Marc Cyr was out with a very bad tooth, so Richard Flynn would do the minutes in his place.

Approval of the February 15, 2016 Minutes:

Richard Flynn (CLASS) substituting for Secretary Cyr:

Flynn (CLASS) moved approval of the February 15, 2016, minutes. Ming Fang He (COE) noted one mistake, that Li Ma was in attendance. Li Ma (COSM) confirmed this and noted that she had not signed in. The minutes were Approved.

Librarian's Report for March 2016:

In the absence of Senate Librarian Jessica Minihan (LIB), Moderator Humphrey moved approval of the report. It was Approved.

Cheryl Aasheim had not arrived, so Undergraduate committee Report was postponed.

Graduate Committee Report

Dustin Anderson (CLASS), Chair: On February 11, 2016, the committee reviewed and discussed their upcoming comprehensive program reviews. Candace Griffith from the Provost's Office provided an overview for the CPR requirements and the new orientation provided for programs under review this year. Also, Anderson introduced CPR reporting and review procedures. The only item of new business was an open discussion of degree descriptions because the committee had expressed some concern and confusion over degree programs creating different tracks that might appear to contain differing workloads. The committee chair agreed to work with the concerned faculty to build a request for data from the College of Graduate Studies on peer and institutional practices in that area. The Interim Associate Dean of COGS along with Wayne Smith from the Registrar's Office provided an update for CourseLeaf. The committee revisited two old business items: The first was a prior learning assessment subcommittee update that's an ongoing project. The second was an untabling of the graduate faculty graduate status revision form and policy that was an item from the January meeting. After discussion, the Interim Associate Dean of COGS suggested submitting a revision of that proposal at one of the upcoming meetings and the item would remain tabled as old business until that time. The final item remained on the table, which was a new READ course, while those departments affected discussed revising that proposal. The report was Approved.

Undergraduate Committee Report

Cheryl Aasheim (CEIT), Chair: for the meeting on February 9th there was only one curriculum item on the agenda, a program in Graphic Communications deleted due to low enrollment. It was Graphic Communication Management. And there was one information item, that Georgia Southern seeks to become an affiliate member of the E-Core Program. They also discussed comprehensive program reviews. The report was Approved.

General Education Committee Report

There was no report from General Education Committee.

President's Report: Jean Bartels

Budget

Full funding for the 3% merit increase was approved by the legislature. The usual caveat to that is that there is a formula by which an institution receives money that never gets to the 3%, so it's going to be somewhere in the neighborhood 2.6 or 2.7 % that will actually come to Georgia Southern and Georgia Southern will use funds to supplement that percentage up to 3% for merit raises. The merit raises this year though are under a restriction. The amounts that can be awarded can be anywhere from between zero and 4% for merit, both on the faculty and the staff side. That's normally how we do it. What's happened this year is that the Board of Regents has determined that we will not be allowed to request anything beyond the 4%. In the past we've had the opportunity to request that we could have a slightly larger increase for an individual faculty member or staff member, up to 6% before you had to go to the Board of Regents to get approval for that. This year they said they're not entertaining that.

Salary Compression

There was no additional money that was allocated either by the legislature or by the Board of Regents for compression. So we do not have any additional new money coming in to address compression issues this year.

Tuition

The Board of Regents determined that we would not have a tuition increase any place in the System this year, and that coupled with our own flat enrollment, means that we can anticipate that there will be literally no new money that is coming to campus for the 2017 fiscal year. So this will be a year where we will be reconsidering the reallocation of what existing resources we have and what is necessary perhaps to assist in selective growth areas through reallocation.

Capital Projects

There was a real cutback in minor and major capital projects at the legislative level, but we did have two minor capital projects approved. One is to do some upgrades to our network operations center. That affects what happens with our internet services and those kind of things, bandwidth, and where all that is housed. The other project is some minor infrastructure additions to the new property across 301, the south campus, to ready it for potential down the road activities.

End-of-Year Money

End-of-year money is also going to be relatively conservative this year. We have a need to use some of our resources to do infrastructure renovations to ready some of our existing properties to house the areas that will have to be overflow areas for units that are misplaced because of the building of the new multidisciplinary classroom building.

HB 859, Campus Carry Legislation

The USG supports the current law and has been very vocal from the Chancellor's level down. It was currently on the Governor's desk. He did ask for some recommendations for amendments to the legislation. The legislative body said that they didn't have time and they were not making them, so it remained on his desk. The Board of Regents did finally contact President Bartels and ask that as a President she submit a letter to the Governor, which she did in strong protest of signing of that legislation.

Sexual Harassment on Campus

The Board of Regents approved several new policies and procedures for addressing sexual harassment on campus, partly in response to Georgia Tech and their President coming under real fire for what was perceived as due process violations for an accused party from an event that happened at the Georgia Tech campus. That kind of started a firestorm of activity with a legislative committee, and some of the backlash to that was threats to hold any of the USG's projects back and budgets back. The good news is that

Georgia Southern has already been doing what the BOR is now making standard system-wide; actually, we were probably a model for how due process is to be followed in those kinds of situations. The new policies, for us, will change only a couple of small procedural items. These changes will be reflected in the Faculty Handbook and in our Policies and Procedures manuals.

Searches

In the Presidential search, the Board of Regents was interviewing the top three candidates. We also were just starting a search process for a new Chief of the University Police Department.

Provost's Report: (Diana Cone):

New Buildings

Military Science Building is on schedule for completion for end of next Fall. The interdisciplinary academic building design team took the preliminary drafts to the System office about a month ago and got approval to move forward with the schematics, looking at either a three-story or what they're calling a three-and-one-half to four story building. Deans have been actively involved with that and having regular meetings with our Facilities folks to make sure that they incorporate all of the things that faculty need and want for those buildings.

Student Ratings of Instruction

We are moving to a new software that will read the new student ratings of instruction forms. Currently we have ScanTron machines at various locations on campus that have a software on them that reads those forms so department staff assistants have to go to those locations and run those ScanTron forms through there, and then have to do some analysis to get the reports. Those machines are old, difficult to maintain, and we pay a fairly high maintenance contract on those each year. With the idea that the committee has brought forward, those machines cannot read that new student ratings of instruction format. The IT folks have been working already with a company called RemarkSoftware to enable the new forms to be read on any scanner or on department copy machines if they have the scanning function. And the pilot went very well. Secretaries will not have to type the comments off of those student forms if there are comments; it will automatically read those into the reports. The new forms will be printing on just regular copy paper that can be run through xerox machines to scan them. So it should be a much quicker process. Office staff will all have to be trained on how to do this and get the software loaded, so our CATS team will be working with each

department rigorously during April and early May. The SRI committee likely will put off piloting the new SRI until Fall so all of this will be in place.

Marshall Ransom (COSM) asked about use of ScanTrons for exams. Provost Cone noted the new format and process is for SRIs only.

Mark Welford (COSM) is on the committee and saw the form and noted that that it is on back to back sheets and wondered how the quantitative and discursive sections would be formatted in the report received by faculty.

Provost Cone said the report will have the same type of scale that he's been seeing in the past, and then at the bottom will have strengths and areas for improvement. Also, it will just scan in what the students wrote, and combine all of those together.

Welford thought the comments should be separate from the numerical values.

Provost Cone they will still be listed separate in the form and we will still be able to run our report for promotion/tenure packets.

Nan LoBue (CLASS) noted that she is on the committee and confirmed that the official pilot is going to be next fall.

Senate Executive Committee Report: (Patricia Humphrey [COSM], Chair.)

Presidential Search Update

Basically the top choices were a consensus of all campus and community groups. So those names did forth to the Board of Regents the morning of March 14th. Moderator Humphrey had talked with Lori Durden, who's the chair of the Regents Committee, and they are holding the Regents interviews the next day. When the announcement would be made was anybody's guess.

Campus Police Chief

Moderator Humphrey and Lisa Abbott (CLASS) had participated that morning in the first of five on campus interviews for the campus police chief. There were four more upcoming in the following week.

Requests for Information

- One from Nan LoBue (CLASS) about Handicapped Access of Older Buildings: Older buildings are grandfathered in in terms of handicapped access. There is a threshold of 50% of the building's value in terms of any major renovations, at which point then that building would be brought up to current standards for handicapped access. However, if you see real needs please tell your department chairs, or tell Rob Whitaker, because they do have special money for just such items that comes down from the state.
- One RFI from Tomasz Warchol and a follow-up from Aimao Zhang on using sick days toward retirement for ORP faculty, and other things which are in all honesty an unfairness between ORP and TRS people, including vesting time and so on. Unfortunately, that cannot be addressed on this campus. That requires legislative action. University System Faculty Council meets with the Chancellor twice a year. They regularly talk about such items. The Chancellor, after the last issue about two years ago with allowing people to switch from ORP to TRS, has stated categorically he's rather unwilling to bring such items forward because they will cost the state money and the state legislature is not in such a good mood for that sort of thing. But if faculty really want to push for such, talk to our local state representatives and state senators: Jon Burns, Jack Hill, Jan Tankersley and so on. They're the ones who are going to act on that one.
- One from Robert Costomiris on salary increases for promotion and professorial rank. Humphrey discussed this one with Dr. Bartels and these raises have not been really looked at since about 2005 (*Correction: 2006*), when they were raised to \$3750 and \$5,000, because basically there hasn't been money. The last several years what money we did get through the state and the BOR towards merit raises and so on had to be supplemented through on campus money to try and reach those 2% raises, which left no money for other things. And this year with flat enrollment there's not a lot of hope for other money to address those either. She suggested that's something that we bring up with the new president when that individual gets here.
- Have there been any plans for communication in terms of the campus carry legislation? In short, no, because everyone was waiting to find out what actually came down in terms of final legislation. When the BOR does know what's actually there, it will be publicized. Board of Regents will have to make their initial policies and then we'll have to make our own.
- Then there was the one from Marc Cyr on Athletic Budget Increases. Yes, the Athletics budget did go up from 2013, \$8.3 million to 2014, \$13.5 million, and the numbers were correct. Most of that, in fact, essentially all of that is due to the move to the FBS, but it's not just football moving to FBS; it's also new sports that were added, like women's shooting and women's golf and so on. A lot of the increase was due to increased numbers of scholarships, increased salaries, and so forth. Humphrey noted that the students taxed themselves in terms of the increase for student fees both through the money for expanding the stadium, and for moving to the FBS, and that does come under the category of institutional

subsidy. She noted that things like the new Astorturf being installed at the stadium is being paid for by Auxiliary Services basically.

Jim Harris (CEIT) asked what year the FBS fees were voted on.

Moderator Humphrey thought it was 2013, and that they took effect for the 13-14 school year.

Harris felt that these fees should be voted on every year by the students so that those actually paying them got to decide to do so, rather than having the expense imposed on them by former students who were no longer liable to the charges.

Moderator Humphrey said she couldn't speak to that. That would probably be a matter for SGA to think about. Errol Spence (SGA Representative) said he could take that back to the Student Government Association for comment.

SGA Motion on Absences – Errol Spence, SGA Vice President of Academic Affairs:

Spence said that as the current policy for attendance reads in the *Faculty Handbook* there is no safeguard for students who attend and represent Georgia Southern University at University related or sponsored events. Under Section 308 in the *Faculty Handbook*, "The University does not issue an excuse to students for class absences. In case of absences as a result of illness, representation of the University in athletic and other activities, or special situations, instructors may be informed of reasons for absences, but these are not excuses."

The SGA recommended that the Faculty Senate move to amend the *Faculty Handbook* to remove the phrase "representation of the University in athletic and other activities," from Section 308 and add a new paragraph under paragraph 3, section 308 to read, **"Students participating in authorized activities as an official representative of the university (i.e. athletic events, delegate to regional or national meetings or conferences, participation in university-sponsored performances) will not receive academic penalties and, in consultation with the instructor of record, will be given reasonable opportunities to complete assignments and exams or given compensatory assignment(s) if needed. The student must provide written confirmation from a faculty or staff advisor to the course instructor(s) not fewer than 10 days prior to the date for which the student will be absent from the class. The student is responsible for all material presented in class and for all announcements and assignments. When possible, students are expected to complete these assignments before their absences. In the event of a disagreement regarding this policy, an appeal may be made by either the student or instructor of record to the corresponding College Dean."**

The purpose of this amendment was to provide students who have officially represented the University through their participation in university-related or sponsored activities with an official policy to prevent them from being penalized for not physically being in the classroom as a result of their participation in said events. Spence said the proposed motion did not seek to prioritize extracurricular activities over academics, as students are responsible for all material presented in class and expected to complete all assignments. Additionally, the motion included academic activities outside the classroom, such as national association meetings and academic conferences. He said the proposal in no way excused students from their academic responsibilities. He noted that many universities have policies such as this, including our aspirational peers, other USG institutions, and Sun Belt conference schools. He was happy to provide a list of those schools if needed.

He added that among the things that make our university attractive to prospective students are opportunities for additional learning opportunities outside of the traditional classroom environment, and such activities should not be academically penalized, since he believed that we all agreed that learning is not simply defined by a grade. In order for students to be competitive in the workplace today, it is expected that they be able to demonstrate to an employer that they are involved in experiences outside of the classroom where they can apply personal, social, and intellectual skills in new contexts as well as demonstrate the ability to manage academic responsibilities. He believed that the students who mainly stand to benefit from this policy are those students who work extremely hard both in the classroom and beyond to achieve academic excellence, while also representing the brand of our University on the regional, national, or even international stage. The SGA respected faculty discretion within the classroom, but also believed that there should be reasonable compromise on matters where there are value added benefits for both the students and the University. He called this proposed policy that compromise. They understood that this policy may be a change, but in order to allow our students to maintain a competitive advantage, our University must meet the demands of our changing environment. He noted that the first paragraph of our "About Us" Webpage states that *"Since 1906, the University's hallmark has been a culture of engagement that bridges theory with practice, extends the learning environment beyond the classroom, and promotes student growth and life success."* The SGA believed that this proposed amendment better supports that mission of the University.

The motion was seconded by Richard Flynn (CLASS).

Ellen Hamilton (CHHS) liked the proposal, with its encompassment of an all-around fulfilling education for our students.

Jim Harris (CEIT) noted that currently the decision on whether students should miss a class is given to the instructor. He wanted to know who was best qualified to make this decision, the instructor in the class, or somebody outside the class. He believed it was

the instructor, but that this proposal put the decision in the hands of someone outside the class. He had looked at the list of schools in the proposal and downloaded their attendance policies. Georgia Tech has a 4-page document illustrating how they're going to handle this through a committee of nine people. So they review each case individually in front of a committee of nine people. The current SGA proposal is just a few sentences added on that says that they're going to give this out to somebody, don't know who, but somebody other than the instructor in the class is going to make the decision whether or not a student can be absent from a class. In his opinion, the proposal needed to be much more finely tuned, and that the instructor had to be part of the process.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) did not entirely agree or disagree with Jim. She believed the proposal had come forward because there are a few professors who are unwilling to work with students in such situations, and so we need to have this policy in place. She agreed there were some problems with the policy and wanted to offer an amendment.

Moderator Humphrey asked if she was making a motion to amend the policy. Abbott said she wanted to make a "friendly amendment," so was unsure if that required a formal motion. She didn't think it addressed all of Harris's issues, and called it "a clarification more than anything else," taking the section that says "will not receive academic penalties and will be given reasonable opportunities to complete assignments and exams or given compensatory assignment(s) if needed" and changing that to read "will not receive academic penalties and in consultation with the instructor of record will be given reasonable opportunities to complete assignments and exams or given compensatory assignments." She thought this clarified that it is in consultation with the instructor and so put the faculty member back in the conversation.

Errol Spence (SGA) accepted this as a friendly amendment.

Karen McCurdy (Parliamentarian) reminded people that a "friendly" amendment is not anything that is in *Robert's Rules*. An amendment is an amendment, period, so it does take a motion and a second.

Ellen Hamilton (CHHS) seconded Abbott's motion to amend. The motion was Approved.

Abbott offered another amendment, to change the final statement "In the event of a disagreement regarding this policy, an appeal may be made by either the student or instructor of record to the corresponding College Dean." Her amendment would read, "by either the student or the instructor of record to the corresponding College

Dean.” *(Secretary’s Note: I cannot see the difference between the two wordings here.)*
Errol Spence (SGA) agreed to that amendment.

Jim Harris (CEIT) still had a problem with who makes the initial decision that a student should be able to miss a class, noting it isn’t stated anywhere in this document.

Moderator Humphrey noted that there is initially a written confirmation from a faculty or staff advisor, which is then presented to the instructor so that then the instructor would be making the decision.

Spence (SGA) confirmed this. The purpose was not to take away faculty discretion, but to prevent academic penalizing of students absent while representing Georgia Southern, and to show that there’s value to students gaining learning opportunities outside of the classroom. He admitted there is a small percentage of students who may go on a lot of opportunities to represent the University, but said they don’t unreasonably do that. They didn’t want to give a limited definition of what could fall under the policy, but only that three things would encompass a university-sponsored activity: if the student is accompanied by a faculty member, or the event is paid for by the University, or the student is representing GSU.

Moderator Humphrey noted that sometimes missing a class means missing something really vital, like a performance or something similar. She asked Spence how this policy would deal with such a situation.

Spence (SGA) said they couldn’t build a policy around those specific instances that may be anomalies, and in the case that they do happen, an appeal to the Dean allows for that to be debated; it may be that a student will just have to sacrifice the experience because other arrangements to do this assignment or group project or whatever cannot be made.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) agreed with Spence, noted that “incompletes” are sometimes an option, and further noted that this proposal is not about students who may want to be absent for frivolous reasons, such as hangovers.

Hani Samawi (JPHCOPH) noted that there was no limit on such absences, that depending on the class missing a certain amount of time would constitute an inability to pass the class whether given an incomplete or not. The policy needed revision to set a limit on missed classes.

Moderator Humphrey noted that a low limit would be unworkable for most athletic teams, and suggested that this was an area covered by the provision for consulting with the instructor and/or dean.

Spence (SGA) agreed, noting some other schools' policies have numbers, while others do not. He noted that many faculty syllabi already have an absence limit stated. He said the policy required students to still get class work done, and said the kinds of students this policy will affect are the type that know they have to do that or not do the activity.

Finbarr Curtis (CLASS) wanted clarification on what was meant by "penalty." For example, Curtis gives a number of pop quizzes, but drops a certain number of those. What happens if someone misses more than the allowed number of drops because of official university activities. Are they then allowed even more dropped quizzes than other students?

Spence (SGA) said such a quiz dispute could be taken to the dean. Broadly, the policy applied only to not being in class, so that if, for example, there is a three absence maximum or a student fails the class, an official absence should not count as one of those three.

Curtis believed there needed to be greater clarity about what "penalty" means.

Jim Harris (CEIT) thought such issues were why Georgia Tech has a four-page document for this, and a committee of nine people to make such decisions, because such special cases do come along. He could see, for example, an instructor having a five absence limit prior to an F, a student using up four of them and then going off for two weeks, so they've missed eight classes, and how are they going to make that up?

Ellen Hamilton (CHHS) thought the Georgia Tech set-up also took the decision out of the instructor's hands. She thought the appeal process in the proposal still gave discretion to the instructor.

James Stephens (JPHCOPH) said he had had requests from students for excused absences during midterms and finals, and he was unsure that this was fair to the other students. He didn't see anything addressing that problem in the proposal. He also wanted to know whether absences had to somehow be related to the class, or if the nature of the event was immaterial under this proposal.

Addressing the Stephens' second question, Spence (SGA) said there is no limit due to class context because a valid absence may not have to do with a specific class. He gave a

Chemistry major participating in the Model U.N. as an example, in which the goal is overall development of the student. As for Stephens' first question, he noted the policy states students could take midterms ahead of time, and he thought this eliminated the issue of unfairness to other students. Anything outside that provision could be appealed to the Dean.

Marshal Ransom (COSM) said the appeal process in the proposal would give Deans a lot of power, and he wondered if the Deans wanted that power. He thought the nine-person committee at Georgia Tech was better because it did not load extra responsibility on one person, the Dean.

Moderator Humphrey opined that there would be no need for a policy like this if everybody was willing to work with the students, but we have a few faculty members who are making life tough.

Spence (SGA) said the power first would lie with the faculty member and the student to come to a reasonable agreement. The Dean would become involved only as a last stop.

Ransom agreed, but noted that the Dean still therefore has final responsibility. Spence said that was already the case for Deans in all sorts of situation.

Lowell Mooney (COBA) thought there were very few faculty "hardasses" on this issue. He thought the policy was dealing with a small number of issues, and that Deans could earn their money by making such decisions already: "We love our students. We love them to represent Georgia Southern around the world. We want to support them in any way we can. We know that it enriches their educational experience. Gives them fond memories of Georgia Southern, so one day they might give lots of money to us. But I just don't think we need a policy . . . when we are already doing that."

Spence called the policy "a safeguard for students" that obviates the need for students to have a perhaps acrimonious negotiation with an instructor.

Ellen Hamilton (CHHS) called the question. This motion was seconded and Approved.

Moderator Humphrey then read the twice-amended motion for amending Section 308: **"Students participating in authorized activities as an official representative of the university (i.e. athletic events, delegate to regional or national meetings or conferences, participation in university-sponsored performances) will not receive academic penalties and, in consultation with the instructor of record, will be given reasonable opportunities to complete**

assignments and exams or given compensatory assignment(s) if needed. The student must provide written confirmation from a faculty or staff advisor to the course instructor(s) not fewer than 10 days prior to the date for which the student will be absent from the class. The student is responsible for all material presented in class and for all announcements and assignments. When possible, students are expected to complete these assignments before their absences. In the event of a disagreement regarding this policy, an appeal may be made by either the student or instructor of record to the corresponding College Dean.” The vote required a counting of hands. The motion was Approved 31-9.

HB 859 Resolution

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) moved this resolution: **“The Faculty Senate of Georgia Southern University stands with University System of Georgia Chancellor Hank Huckaby and the Board of Regents in opposing Georgia House Bill 859 (the “campus conceal and carry bill”) and asks Governor Nathan Deal to veto it.”** She noted that Faculty Senates across the System were voting on this resolution to get it to Governor Deal so that he would, it was hoped, veto “this insanity.”

The motion was Approved unanimously.

Unfinished Business

None

New Business

None

Announcements: Vice Presidents

None

Announcements from the Floor

None

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn, seconded and passed

4-20-2016

4-20-2016 Faculty Senate Minutes

Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Georgia Southern University, "4-20-2016 Faculty Senate Minutes" (2016). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 15.
<http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/15>

This minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Faculty Senate Minutes
April 20, 2016
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
****Russell Union Ballroom****

Voting Members in Attendance: Cheryl Aasheim, Lisa Abbott, Sam Adeyeye, Scott Beck, Kelly Berry, Chad Posick for Sarah Bielski, Sally Ann Brown, Ashley Colquitt for Moya Alfonso, Gavin Colquitt, Finbarr Curtis, Marc Cyr, Larisa Elisha, Steven Elisha, Matthew Flynn for Leticia McGrath, Richard Flynn, Alice Hall, Ming Fang He, Jonathan Hilpert, Yi Hu, Scott Kersey, Barbara King, Arpita Saha for Shainaz Landge, Alisa Leckie, Li Li, Lawrence Locker, Ron MacKinnon, Alan Mackelprang, Jessica Minihan, Lowell Mooney, Shahnam Navaee, Constantin Ogloblin, Marshall Ransom, Jake Simons, Jim Stephens, Mark Welford, Tharanga Wickramarachchi, Leigh Ann Williams for Tim Giles

Voting Members Not in Attendance: Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, Olga Amarie, William Amponsah, Adam Bossler, John Dyer, Mark Edwards, Tim Giles, Ellen Hamilton, Jim Harris, Alina Iacob, Mujibur Khan, Lili Li, Jim LoBue, Nan LoBue, Li Ma, Santanu Majumdar, Bryan Miller, Joe Ruhland, Lina Soares, Valentin Soloiu, Linda L. Thompson,

Senate Moderator and Chair Senate Executive Committee: Patricia Humphrey

NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman

Parliamentarian: Karen McCurdy

Student Government Association: Errol Spence

Administrators: Jean Bartels, Diana Cone, Rob Whitaker, Martha Abell, Mohammad Davoud, Barry Joyner, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker, D. Jason Slone

Visitors: Hyo-Joo Han, Dustin Anderson, Christine Ludowise, Clement Lau

Secretary's Note: This time our recording achieved perfection: Absolutely nothing was recorded. What follows is based on my minimalist notes.

Approval of the Agenda for the April 20, 2016 meeting: Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee:

Moved and Approved.

Approval of the March 23, 2016 Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary:

Cyr noted that he was moving approval of the minutes prepared by Richard Flynn (CLASS), but that a version condensed by Cyr would be linked as an addendum to those minutes when they were posted. The minutes were Approved.

Librarian's Reports for April 2016, Jessica Minihan (LIB), Senate Librarian.

Moved and Approved.

Undergraduate Committee Report – Cheryl Aasheim (CEIT), Chair

Moved and Approved.

Graduate Committee Report – Dustin Anderson (CLASS), Chair

Moved and Approved.

General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Report – Marshall Ransom (COSM), substituting for Michelle Cawthorn (COSM), Chair

Moved and Approved.

President's Report: Jean Bartels

This Year's Budget

At least in part because the BOR is trying to fend off moves by the legislature to take over the power to set tuition and fees, per BOR direction, there will be no tuition increases at USG institutions this coming year; fees are almost entirely frozen too. While we hope for 100-200 more students in Fall, our budget will be pretty much flat.

Campus Carry Legislation

This was on the Governor's desk with no recommendations for amendments coming from the Legislature. He has three options: Approve, Veto, or leave it unsigned, in which case it will come into effect anyway but without his signature. The signing due date is May 3rd. If the law goes into effect, we will await BOR guidance on how to proceed. One thing is clear, however: Individual faculty and staff will not be able to make their own rules regarding guns in their own classrooms and offices.

13th President

Dr. Jaimie Hebert will become our President on July 1, 2016.

New Chief of University Police Department

Laura McCullough is our new Police Chief, the first woman to hold that position.

Progress on Military Science Building

Official completion date is set for November 17, 2016.

Multidisciplinary Academic Building

All needed approvals have been granted. Construction is slated to start December of 2016, with projected completion in May 2018.

Provost's Report: Diana Cone

We are ahead of where we were last year on pre-registration for Fall.

Senate Executive Committee Report: Patricia Humphrey [COSM], Chair.

She corrected some errors in the reply to an RFI about raises for promotion submitted by Robert Costamiris as reported in March. The new raise structure took effect in 2006 (not 2005). Raises had been \$1000 promotion from instructor to assistant professor, \$1500 (promotion to associate professor), and \$2000. The current amount of these raises is \$3000 for promotion to associate and \$5000 for promotion to professor.

There were no motions, RFIs, or discussion requests submitted this month.

Chancellor Huckaby met with the University System of Georgia Faculty Council (USGFC) at Valdosta State on April 15. He said something (it was not entirely clear to Humphrey) about it being okay to carry budgets forward. He also seemed to be strongly suggesting that the idea of "Performance Formula Funding" was being allowed to die out. The Chancellor also noted that enrollment is up or steady at 16 system schools, and down at 14. The announced 3% merit/retention raises have been fully funded by the legislature, but nevertheless not all of that will reach our campus, so we'll need to find it elsewhere on campus. There will be no increase in funding for health insurance, so our rates are almost certain to go up again next year. Rumors of more school mergers are still just that, rumors.

The BOR is dead serious about schools adhering to rigorous implementation of policies and procedures re: Title IX. The problems at Georgia Tech involved not giving due process to those accused of violations.

Elections: Senate Secretary and Librarian for 2016 – 2017

Marc Cyr (CLASS) was the sole candidate for Secretary and was elected for 2016-17.

The candidates for Librarian were Evans Afriyie-Gyawu (JPHCOPH), Alice Hall (CHHS), and Mark Welford (COSM). Welford was elected for 2016-2017.

Unfinished Business

None.

Deleted: down

Deleted: stable or slightly up

Deleted: BOR

New Business

None.

Announcements: Vice Presidents

None

Announcements from the Floor

None.

Adjournment

Moved and Approved.

6-7-2016

6-7-2016 Faculty Senate Minutes

Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Georgia Southern University, "6-7-2016 Faculty Senate Minutes" (2016). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 14.
<http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/14>

This minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Faculty Senate Minutes
June 7, 2016
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Nessmith-Lane Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: Cheryl Aasheim, Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, Matthew Flynn for Olga Amarie, William Amponsah, Scott Beck, Sarah Bielski, Gavin Colquitt, Finbarr Curtis, Marc Cyr, Tom Pearsall for Larisa Elisha, Jennifer Kowalewski for Steven Elisha, Richard Flynn, Tim Giles, Alice Hall, Jim Harris, Ming Fang He, Stephen Carden for Yi Hu, Scott Kersey, Mujibur Khan, Shainaz Landge, Alisa Leckie, Jim LoBue, Nan LoBue, Lawrence Locker, Sajumdar Majumdar, Leticia McGrath, Jessica Minihan, Lowell Mooney, Shahnaz Navaee, Lina Soares, Hana Samawi for James Stephens, Linda L. Thompson, Tharanga Wickramarachchi

Members not in Attendance: Ellen Hamilton, Jonathan Hilpert, Barbara King, Li Li, Lili Li, Li Ma, Ron MacKinnon, Alan Mackelprang, Bryan Miller, Constantin Ogloblin, Marshall Ransom, Joe Ruhland, Jake Simons, Valentin Soloiu, Mark Welford

Administrators in Attendance: Jean Bartels, Martha Abell, Diana Cone, Barry Joyner, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker

Visitors: Greg Brock, Meca Williams-Johnson, Vince Cardenas, Candace Griffith, Brooke Salter, D. Jason Slone, Dustin Anderson, Rocio Alba-Flores, Maura Copeland

Senate Moderator and Chair Senate Executive Committee: Patricia Humphrey

Parliamentarian: Karen McCurdy

[Approval of the Agenda for the June 7, 2016 meeting.](#)

Moved and Approved.

[Approval of the April 20, 2016 Minutes: Marc Cyr \(CLASS\), Senate Secretary.](#)

Cyr noted some corrections had been made because of omissions caused by the lack of a recording of that meeting. So amended, the minutes were Moved and Approved.

[Librarian's Reports for June 2016, Jessica Minihan \(LIB\), Senate Librarian.](#)

Moved and Approved.

Undergraduate Committee Report – Cheryl Aasheim (CEIT), Chair:

The Committee unanimously approved four comprehensive program reviews: BM in Music Education, BM in Performance, BS in Fashion Merchandising and Apparel Design, and core curriculum Gen Ed. In addition, they approved 42 course revisions, across four colleges, the majority in the College of Engineering and IT. They are still adjusting to the new Manufacturing Engineering and the Engineering Program, and this led to two program revisions: one in Manufacturing Engineering and one in Mechanical Engineering. They also approved the committee's meeting schedule for next year. The report was Moved and Approved.

Graduate Committee Report – Dustin Anderson (CLASS), Chair

They approved twelve comprehensive program reviews: the Graduate Certificate in Applied Economics, the Graduate Certificate in Enterprise Resource Planning, the Masters in Applied Economics, the Ph.D. in Logistics and Supply Chain Management, the Graduate Certificate in Dietetic Internship, the Post-Masters Certificate in Nurse Educator, the Post-Masters Certificate in Family Nurse Practitioner, Certificates in Occupational Safety & Environmental Compliance, Engineering & Manufacturing Management, the Graduate Certificate in Public History, the MA in History, and the MS in Psychology. There was a high level of praise for the CPR in Public History, which was a finely written report. Two very substantive results came from those Comprehensive Program Reviews: One was a request for earlier and more uniform access to program data, and this has been passed to the Provost's Office; and the second was a clear need for more education in diversity and management in that area. A number of new business items will be addressed during the following meeting cycle. Regarding old business, they approved the Prior Learning Assessment document and asked that to be moved forward to COGS. They also addressed the long tabled Graduate Faculty Status item and approved it with slight changes to both the form and policy. Anderson noted that since the meeting there have been questions raised about the definition of lecturers, as there seems to be some disparity between colleges as far as what lecturers do and how they are addressed on that form and in that policy. They also approved their upcoming meeting schedule.

Moderator Humphrey believed that the Prior Learning Assessment and the Graduate Faculty Status changes, in terms of who is eligible to be graduate faculty and so on, ought to come as separate motions to the Senate instead of just being approved as part of the Graduate Faculty report because we need to know more before just approving those items.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) moved that those two items be removed and brought separately to the Senate. There was a second.

Anderson asked what the appropriate format would be to bring those forward to the Faculty Senate for discussion.

Moderator Humphrey said those should be two separate motions because they are two separate situations, but to talk with incoming Moderator Richard Flynn.

Anderson noted that likely the Prior Learning Assessment issue would be fairly straightforward, but the Graduate Faculty Status item came from the then Interim Associate Dean of COGS, he did not know who was in that position now, and assumed that the committee would need to work with that person to make that motion.

Moderator Humphrey said he should work with the Provost. Richard Flynn (CLASS) asked that Humphrey and others send their concerns either to him or Anderson or both, so that they can be addressed while Anderson is working on the motion.

Humphrey noted that one of her concerns was that the Graduate Faculty item came forward at the very end of that Graduate Committee meeting and there were only six people in attendance at that point, which means the whole Graduate Committee did not really vote on that.

Flynn, a member of that committee, noted that the meeting was very long and he himself had had to leave to teach class. Anderson noted that the item had been a matter of ongoing discussion, but also that he was fine with bringing it to the Senate for further discussion.

Cyr's motion was Approved. The Graduate Committee Minutes, thus amended, were Approved.

President's Report (Jean Bartels)

Changes at the University

Vice President for Information Technology and CIO, Dr. Steve Burrell, has taken a position as the new Chief Information Technology Officer at Northern Arizona University. Our Interim Chief Technology Officer will be Ron Stalnaker who most of you

know will be taking over that responsibility. The College of Graduate Studies will for the moment be under the Provost's Office pending reorganization of COGS under incoming President Hebert. President Bartels noted that we have had a number of resignations in COGS, including almost everybody on the academic administrative side. She welcomed input on the COGS reorganization from anyone that has worked closely with COGS.

Faculty Spotlight

President Bartels highlighted that there is a "Faculty Spotlight" located on the University website under the Newsroom. It appears every month highlighting a different faculty member who is doing interesting and exciting things, but may not be getting appropriate attention. June's Faculty Spotlight was on [Dr. Jonathan Hilpert](#), an Associate Professor of Curriculum, Foundations and Reading in the College of Education, featuring a video about the work that he is doing and the kind of excitement he has about being a faculty member here at Georgia Southern.

Dr. Jaimie Hebert

Dr. Jaimie Hebert will be our 13th President, starting July 1st, though he was already relocated to Statesboro and, besides many discussions with President Bartels, he was familiarizing himself with campus by walking about and chatting with folks he ran into.

Thank You

President Bartels thanked everyone on Faculty Senate, noting that such service doesn't get the recognition that it needs to have. She particularly thanked Pat Humphrey, who was leaving as the Senate Moderator. She recognized Humphrey's most recent two-year stint as Moderator and awarded her a plaque with "the great hammer on it," the plaque reading, "In recognition of Dr. Pat Humphrey for dedicated service to Georgia Southern University: Moderator of the Faculty Senate 2014-2016." President Bartels also gave her flowers.

Closing

President Bartels noted how honored she had been to serve as Interim President, and noted that she would be returning to the position of Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for a period of time. She also noted that the Provost's personal office is going to relocate to where Information Technology's VP Office is right now, on the first floor of Pittman, so the Provost's office floor can be stopped from tilting toward the abyss. She also noted that she would be having hip replacement surgery on June 23.

Moderator Humphrey stated the Senate's thanks to President Bartels for all she has done.

Provost's Report: (Diana Cone)

SOAR

On this day, we were having our second registration; the first session, the week before, went very well. She encouraged Senators to thank the advisors, who were working hard and well.

New Academic Building

On time and on schedule. The Deans of the two involved colleges have worked with the design team and brought in their folks who will have laboratories. Construction should start in January. To that end, Parking and Transportation has worked out a schedule so that faculty parking will still be available behind the building because that faculty parking that will be blocked by the construction zone will be compensated for by moving that lot's student parking to behind COE and the Wildlife Center.

COGS

We have moved a few people to do a few different assignments in the College of Graduate Studies. We have called in a few folks from the Library who will help with electronic theses and dissertations, and the CT2 staff will be doing more with notifying students about the graduate assistant training/TA training. Also, folks in the Provost's office are overseeing a lot of the operations. If anyone finds that something is not working satisfactorily, Provost Cone asked to be informed because they are trying to get a handle on what's working well and what needs improvement. For one thing, they had found that a number of processes have been done manually, unlike on the undergraduate side, so they were hoping to make things a little bit smoother and maybe a little bit more efficient and faster as the weeks go on.

Year-end Projects

The Writing Center will move to the main floor of the Library. Construction and remodeling of that has already started and should be finished by the end of summer Term B, and the Writing Center should be moved and ready for the start of the fall term. Re: swing space for those displaced by the new academic building is being renovated; some places in the Human Ecology building are being prepared so that interior design will have some laboratory and office space there, and also in the old Health Center.

Provost Cone noted that the Library depends heavily on year-end funding to renew subscriptions, and each year the cost of subscriptions goes up, and this year we are about \$1.2 million short to pay for those subscriptions. We have funded a little bit of that already with some year-end funds, but typically as projects are completed on campus and it comes in where it's a little bit less costly than anticipated, those funds get shifted to the Library. But Dean Mitchell will not know until we get to June 30th and we know what kind of funds we shift to him, if there are any subscriptions that we will not be able to renew. He will invite faculty and administrators of affected programs to give input into which ones to keep and which ones not to keep, though he is very concerned that this timeline gives little time for that input.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) noted that compared to other system schools, we underfund our library and said we need to change both the system and level of funding.

Ming Fang He (COE) expressed her concern about how COGS was functioning. President Bartels repeated her earlier comments on that subject.

Senate Executive Committee Report: (Patricia Humphrey [COSM], Chair.)

She simply noted that there was virtually nothing to report.

Unfinished Business

None.

New Business

None.

Announcements: Vice Presidents

None.

Announcements from the Floor

None.

Adjournment

Moved and Approved.

9-6-2016

9-6-2016 Faculty Senate Minutes

Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Georgia Southern University, "9-6-2016 Faculty Senate Minutes" (2016). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 13.
<http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/13>

This minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Faculty Senate Minutes
September 6, 2016
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: Cheryl Aasheim, Lisa Abbott, Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, Mete Akcaoglu, Rocio Alba-Flores, Moya Alfonso, Dragos Amarie, Dustin Anderson, Kelly Berry, (Elizabeth Butterfield for Sarah Bielski), Ted Brimeyer, Gavin Colquitt, Finbarr Curtis, Marc Cyr, David Dudley, Mark Edwards, Larisa Elisha, Richard Flynn, Alice Hall, Eric Hall, Ellen Hamilton, Ming Fang He, Jonathan Hilpert, Yi Hu, Bob Jackson, (Karelle Aiken for Scott Kersey), Mujibur Khan, Barbara King, Hsiang-Jui Kung, Eric Landers, Alisa Leckie, Lili Li, Jim LoBue, (Lisa Denmark for Lawrence Locker), Alan Mackelprang, Ron MacKinnon, Leticia McGrath, Ed Mondor, Lowell Mooney, Eudia Ochieng, Rob Pirro, Peter Rogers, Fred Smith, Chasen Smith, (Matthew Flynn and Jennifer Kowalewski (2nd hour) for Janice Steirn), Sam Todd, Mark Welford, Tharanga Wickramarachchi, Meca Williams-Johnson

NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman

Voting Members Not in Attendance: Sam Adeyeye, Adam Bossler, Tim Giles, Alina Iacob, Li Ma, Santanu Majumdar, Constantin Ogloblin, Jake Simons, Valentin Soloiu, James Stephens, Linda L. Thompson, Shijun Zheng

Administrators in Attendance: Jaimie Hebert, Jean Bartels, Diana Cone, Don McLemore, Rob Whitaker, Martha Abell, Greg Evans, Barry Joyner, Thomas Koballa, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker

Visitors: Richard Cleveland, Eunbae Lee, Hans-Jorge Schanz, Candace Griffith, Olga Amarie, Charles H. Wilson, D. Jason Slone, Delena Bell Gatch, Beth Durodoeye, Christine Ludowise

Secretary's Note: *Beginning after Provost Bartels' report, occasional problems with the recording crop up due to incorrect operation of the microphones by some Senators and Others. At times, speakers cannot be heard or cannot be clearly heard.*

1. Approval of the Agenda for the September 6, 2016 meeting.

Moved and Approved.

2. Approval of the June 7, 2016 Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary.

Cyr noted minor typos on pages 2, 3, and 6, and on page 3 an unrevised section that was posted along with the revision of that section. With the typos corrected and that unrevised section omitted, he moved for approval. The minutes were Approved.

3. Librarian's Report for September, 2016, Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Librarian. (Marc Cyr [CLASS], Senate Secretary, reported for Mark Welford [COSM], Senate Librarian)

Cyr noted that he had questions, which he had emailed to the Senate list prior to the meeting, about the Academic Standards Committee report. He said that the numbers regarding total appeals and approved appeals did not add up: In the June 17th meeting, it was reported that there were 14 appeals denied by the committee, 3 appeals approved, but this was reported as adding up to 16. For May 16th, 9 were denied, 6 were approved, for a reported total of 13. Then on May 12th, 58 were automatically approved, 17 denied, and 7 approved, for a reported total of 79.

Mark Edwards (COSM) noted a technical definition of total appeals below each table, thought that might account for Cyr's arithmetical difficulties, but said he couldn't figure it out either.

There being no one from the committee present to address the issues, Cyr moved that the Librarian's report be approved with the exception of the Academic Standards Committee report, which would be sent back for clarification. The motion was Approved.

Undergraduate Committee Report – None. Committee first meets September 13

Graduate Committee Report – None. Committee first meets September 8

General Education and Core Curriculum Committee, Michelle Cawthorn (COSM), Chair: Nothing new to report.

4. President's Report (Jaimie Hebert):

President Hebert had no formal report since he is still in the listen and learn part of his tenure. He noted his oft-repeated statement that a major part of the honor of being President of GSU is the honor of working with our faculty, and that he always considers himself to be, first, a member of the faculty, and always keeps in mind that academics is

our first mission. He called himself “a fervent believer in self-governance, and faculty governance.” He said our senate operates differently than those of his previous institutions, where administrators were not active participants in faculty senate, but he was delighted to be a participant here, seeing this “as a joint venture, working with my colleagues to ensure that we provide the higher educational experience that we promise to our students when they come here.” He urged everyone to participate in the survey he sent out some time ago so that “as we move forward in a collected visioning process we have that data to base the early stages of our visioning process on.” He opened himself up for questions, but there were none.

5. Provost’s Report: (Jean Bartels)

Provost Bartels noted that the microphones could be, conveniently, locked “on.”

[Secretary’s Note: Thus, in innocence, was the seed sown from which the whirlwind of our recording problems would be reaped.]

Relocation of the Provost’s Office

Due to renovations underway to the Provost’s office suite, the Provost’s Office is now temporarily in Pittman 1002, with most of the Academic Affairs staff located on the first floor of Veazey. Renovations should be complete by January.

College of Graduate Studies

COGS is reorganizing. Several staff members have departed, and we are working to make COGS “a very service-driven, service-oriented entity for our Graduate Program,” gathering information from Graduate Committee members and program directors in particular. She welcomed any feedback that people have in terms of what COGS does that is indispensable, and what slows down processes. Diana Cone is serving as the Interim Director. All of the current functions of COGS are intact. They are doing serious thinking about how we use the College of Graduate Studies as a recruitment vehicle, with some studies showing current practices are not as effective as they could be.

Unsatisfactory Teaching Evaluation for Late Grades

Provost Bartels responded to an RFI on this subject of late grade submissions by faculty. Her office has noticed over the last couple of semesters in particular a substantial increase in the number of faculty who have not recorded their final grades by the time that they are required to by virtue of our timelines. She stressed the importance of doing so because it affects financial aid for students and the workings of our Registrar’s Office. Too often this failure was on the part of faculty whose reasons were along the lines of having “plans to be gone or they just didn’t kind of get to it yet, but they would be fine,

they would get to it sometime in the next week.” She therefore had asked the deans to examine their own areas and identify people who did this habitually. Different deans responded to this request in different ways, but there was no new policy established by the Provost. However, she reiterated that “it really is a critical responsibility for faculty and anyone teaching a course to make sure that they do the end part of that, which is recording their grades in a timely manner as requested.” She further noted that some faculty have perceived that they can just call the Registrar, say they’ll be late, and everything is okay, but the Registrar’s office is not in a position to make that decision, so she is moving to change the wording on our paperwork to reflect that reality.

Open Textbooks and Online Resources

She alerted us that the University System of Georgia has an ongoing request for faculty to use open textbooks and online resources that would help to defray book costs for students. There was to be, on September 9th, a webinar called [Affordable Learning Georgia](#) and USG is working with GALILEO to make educational resources more affordable. She urged faculty to think seriously about whether there are resources in that very large, free repository that could substitute very easily for a textbook.

StudySoup

StudySoup is a group that hires students to become detailed note takers in particular classes, collecting materials that faculty may have produced, along with all the faculty member’s notes and lecture materials, and then they sell that back to students so they don’t have to work quite so hard. This is an infringement of any faculty member’s materials, and also a violation of our solicitation rules. She asked faculty to report “unusual behavior” so the university can take action to block this activity. We currently have a cease and desist order against this outfit.

Ellen Hamilton (CHHS) said one of her Nursing students received an email and was approached by StudySoup.

Retirement

Provost Bartels will retire effective 6/30. She said her time at GSU “has been a wonderful ride” and she has loved being with the Senate “most of the time. There’s been a moment or two where it was a little more challenging, but not as a rule.” She emphasized how important faculty have been to her, and thanked all faculty.

Rob Pirro (CLASS) asked if Provost Bartels had data on the percentage of faculty submitting grades late, and on the increase in such submissions.

Provost Bartels did not. It was her perception that the list of names took up progressively more space on the sheets of paper in reports. She could get the data, though, if Pirro “were really interested in that.”

Pirro asked if he was correct that 48 hours is the required time for reporting. Provost Bartels thought the deadline was usually “by the Sunday by midnight or some time like that.”

Pirro found it “implausible that faculty are saying well, maybe next week I’ll get it done, or is that really the case?”

Provost Bartels said, “That is really, actually the case,” but noted that sometimes late grades are the result of uncontrollable circumstances, such as online malfunctions, and the school makes provisions for such cases. Also, new and adjunct faculty might not be familiar with the deadlines, but the increase is mostly among “more general faculty who we thought probably knew the expectation a little better.”

Pirro then asked about the Open-Source online resources, wondering if besides advantages, thought had been given to the disadvantages, such as students not graduating with a personal library to mark their own education and encourage reading in their children, and not having the joys of holding and smelling books. He asked if this online resource is only envisioned for the very expensive textbooks, or all books.

Provost Bartels said it’s not designed to be mandatory for anybody, but the repository is quite extensive, with everything from core materials that could substitute for textbooks students are unlikely to keep anyway, up to “more extensive texts.” She added that, like Pirro, she likes “to read a book and hold it in my hands and smell it and touch it. I suspect if I had surveyed most of our population of students that it is never an experience they have at this point had, nor ever wanted in their life because they are on their device, and I think we’re unfortunately . . . seeing a shift, you know, in what students, how students take in information.” But she noted the critical issue is cost, and that many students don’t buy assigned texts because they can’t afford them, and sometimes such costs lead to students leaving school. She also noted that materials in many expensive textbooks become quickly outdated so that it is useless and, in some cases such as her own field of Nursing, actually dangerous.

Pirro next asked if there was a timeline for the new Provost search. President Hebert said they will be putting that together quickly.

Mark Edwards (COSM) asked what a student sees in WINGS when grades are submitted late. Provost Bartels said they see nothing except that no grade has been put there.

Edwards recalled it used to tell the student “Professor Grade Late” and the professor then had to submit a change of grade form. Provost Bartels said a professor still has to fill out a change of grade form for each student. Edwards suggested they be required to fill it out in triplicate. Provost Bartels would go along with that only if carbon copies were also required. Seriously, she noted that the Provost’s office and the deans work to contact faculty who appear on the verge of late submission to remind them and to find out if some uncontrollable problem has arisen. Still, they frequently get frustrating responses from some faculty.

Hans Schanz (COSM) [*inaudible, but this seems to be about StudySoup*] suggested that the university draft a copyright statement to go into class syllabi. Provost Bartels would look into that, but also noted that faculty can just put the copyright sign on the bottom.

Lisa Leckie (COE) noted her personal experience with the USG Open Source initiative is that they are looking at courses such as Biology and Chemistry, which tend to be extremely expensive. If desired, material can be printed out, so it is not leaving the textbook altogether, just finding a more affordable means to provide materials for students.

[*Someone unidentifiable*] said faculty in some colleges were told late grade submissions would now earn a faculty member an automatic unsatisfactory teaching evaluation for the year. Should we understand that that’s not policy or can Deans still do that at the college level?

Provost Bartels said that is not official university policy. She noted that teaching evaluations consider many factors, and she believed “persistent failure” to turn in grades on time should result in some kind of at least comment and perhaps consequences, but should not as a sole cause result in a negative evaluation.

6. Senate Executive Committee Report: (Richard Flynn [CLASS], Chair.)

There were no agenda motion requests, but three RFIs which had all been answered: One was on the new Tasers on Campus law which was answered by Maura Copeland; one about the Summer Study Abroad Salary Model, which was answered by Dr. Bartels; and the one about Unsatisfactory Teaching Evaluation for Late Grades, which was answered in writing that morning and just reported on by Dr. Bartels. He noted some elections upcoming later in the meeting.

7. Report on NCAA Sanctions: Chris Geyerman (CLASS), Faculty Athletic Representative

Geyerman discussed the case that was publicly announced on July 7, 2016. This case originated on September 16, 2013 and it concluded on July 7, 2016. It involved two separate incidents, which is one of the reasons it dragged on. Until now, he had been prohibited from discussing the matter except in vague terms by NCAA policies, specifically Bylaw 19, which prohibit individuals with knowledge of a case from talking about it publicly until the case is determined by the NCAA.

Geyerman said that in each of the two incidents involved the institution initiated the investigations, and self-reported the violations to the NCAA.

The first case happened in September 2013. A professor notified our head football coach that a student-athlete had submitted a paper on folio that had been previously submitted. The football coach notified the appropriate person in Compliance Student-Athlete Services and the Athletic Director. Georgia Southern initiated an internal investigation and found that the Assistant Director of Compliance took the class three years prior that the student-athlete was enrolled in. It was a graduate class, and the student-athlete transferred from another institution with eligibility still remaining. The employee gave the student-athlete her USB Port with the information from the class on it and said it might be helpful to him. The student-athlete turned it in as his own. The institutional staff member's employment was terminated within a matter of three or four days, and GSU wrote up and self-reported the incident to the NCAA in February of 2014. Geyerman said that, as a faculty member, his biggest concern when academic misconduct arises, is how far-reaching it is, and in this particular incident he wasn't too worried because the likelihood of a graduate transfer coming in and registering for the class that the person suggesting their course schedule has already had is pretty minimal.

Another incident emerged in Fall 2014: The Assistant Director of Student Services wrote and submitted ten extra credit assignments for two football student-athletes. This came to the program's notice when some of the individual's colleagues notified their superior that they thought something wasn't quite right with this employee's conduct in a couple of different ways. An internal investigation started to gather evidence and the student-athletes were declared ineligible. The employee initially denied wrongdoing, but computer searches indicated that she had submitted, for example, "keycards into Cone Hall happening at 6:30 a.m." and one of the papers was submitted while the student was playing a football game. It became apparent that this employee "went to great lengths to cover her tracks." Geyerman also noted that in the first incident the employee encouraged the student-athlete to cook up a story and lie.

In both cases, then, there was clear evidence that the employees were aware of their wrongdoing, and, Geyerman noted, “that’s a positive thing when you are working with the NCAA because of the notion that there is a culture of compliance and that it’s not a systemic kind of thing over in that office.”

The professor in the second case was notified that cheating was going on in his class in the form of the Assistant Director of Student-Athlete Services submitting these papers, but that all the interviews and other evidence made them confident that the student-athletes had nothing to do with the cheating: Both had failed the course, had quit turning in work and were not showing up for exams, all of which indicate a student who has given up on the course. Meanwhile, those extra credit papers were still coming in.

Geyerman said this case was more concerning given that it was an employee submitting papers, ten of them, and that raised questions of how wide this problem might be. They hired independent counsel, a compliance group out of Kansas who specialize in this sort of thing. This group came in behind the internal investigation to conduct interviews to validate or invalidate GSU’s findings. That internal investigation included representatives from Georgia Southern from Information Technology Services, Compliance, Student-Athlete Services, the Provost’s office, Vice President for Legal Affairs, Athletic Director, FAR, Vice President for Business and Finance, and the Associate Vice President for Human Resources. 21 student-athletes were interviewed. GSU self-reported these additional violations on May 28, 2015.

At that point the NCAA bundled this incident with the first one, and it took about a year for the whole thing to be processed. On July 7, 2016, the NCAA announced their finding. On June 9, 2016, the NCAA Committee on Enforcement panel, and an institutional panel conducted a hearing via videoconference. GSU is on probation for two years; that expires July 6, 2018. We were fined \$5,000 plus \$43,000, given two scholarship reductions this year in football, and 10% recruiting restrictions this academic year, so rather than our average of 48 we will have 44 or 43. We also have 10% off-campus recruiting restrictions, so “That’s going to fall this year from 42 to 38%.”

Geyerman felt confident because all of the violations were characterized standard or mitigated level 1 by the NCAA. The most serious NCAA charge is for what is called “lack of institutional control,” and that was never on the table. There was no failure to monitor either, and that’s the second most serious penalty that the NCAA can level, and there wasn’t a failure to monitor because we caught all of this stuff before any fraudulent academic credit was ever generated.

Geyerman felt confident that there’s a culture of compliance that is in place in Student-Athlete Services in the Athletics Department. The mitigating factors for the institution

were instrumental in helping us. They were, in the NCAA's words, "prompt self-detection and self-disclosure of the violations, prompt acknowledgement of the violations, acceptance of responsibility, and the imposition of meaningful corrective measures and/or penalties, affirmative steps to expedite final resolution of the matter, and the implementation of a system of compliance methods designed to insure rules compliance and satisfaction of the institution coaches control standards." Geyerman felt very confident that the problems were not systemic in this particular investigation, and in his opinion the way that all of the personnel involved at Georgia Southern handled it was text book, exactly what a university should do when something wrong happens in the Athletics Department. Since we're on probation for two years, we do not need any more violations at all, particularly serious ones. Geyerman attended the Athletics Department staff meeting at the start of the year and the Athletics Director made it abundantly clear that everything has to be done by the book.

Geyerman then opened up for questions.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said that before Geyerman began his report, he had had

25 questions to ask

him. He still had 24. He suggested that he submit them to Geyerman in writing for a later response, and said he would send them to the Senate as well. Moderator Flynn agreed that was the best course to take.

Geyerman noted that he and Cyr used to be very, very good friends. Cyr asked, "What are friends for?"

[Someone unidentifiable] (COSM) asked if these students went through the Office of Student Conduct like any other student would for such academic infractions.

Geyerman said yes. In the first case, the professor reported the student, the student met with the professor, followed the conduct code, took the route, had no record, and elected to have the faculty member adjudicate the case. In the second case, the professor declined to file academic misconduct charges because the professor was also quite sure that the students had no knowledge that the papers were submitted. And that's one that it took the NCAA a little bit of a moment to understand.

8. Unfinished Business

Moderator Flynn (CLASS) noted that at the June meeting of the Faculty Senate two parts of the Graduate Committee Report were pulled from the Graduate Report for further consideration, one of which was now on the agenda as a Discussion Item.

Discussion Item: [COGS Prior Learning Assessment Policy](#)

Dustin Anderson (CLASS), Graduate Committee chair, noted that the committee had been working on this for an extended period of time and felt confident that this was ready to come before the Faculty Senate as a proposal, then opened to questions to be answered by himself or other committee members present.

Alan Mackelprang (COBA) asked what the expected number of requests might be.

Meca Williams-Johnson (COE) said they do not initially expect a large number of students to make this request. The committee wanted to make sure that every department had control over how many were accepted. Students can request up to 9 credit hours, but a prior learning experience would have to be very specific and unique in order to satisfy the requirements of the course.

Lowell Mooney (COBA) [*partly inaudible*] asked if the fees will go to the department that takes the time to do the evaluations. He also thought giving three hours of credit for one hour of tuition, and releasing the student from 15 weeks in class, is a big incentive to have these requests coming out of the woodwork and would be a substantial hit to faculty service load as time progresses. He liked the 9-hour provision, but wondered if we need to leave the cost out of our ads until we see how many requests we get, and he wanted fees to go to the departments conducting the reviews.

Meca Williams-Johnson (COE) believed that the student should pay for the one credit hour before a committee even begins its evaluation, and believed that would make students think carefully about making such requests. However, the committee would be willing to reconsider the fees and deferring them to departments. She added that departments would control “how much and how many people we’ll be evaluating.”

Anderson agreed with Williams-Johnson, and added that he didn’t think there will be university-level marketing for this. This is a uniform approach that every program would have to undertake and market, which marketing would impact the number of requests. Departments could choose not to offer this, or to “market 9 hours at a 3 hour rate,” though he didn’t believe that was the spirit of the proposal. Nevertheless, all would be decided at the program level for each of the programs in the university.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) thought one issue needing clarification is the fees, and shared Mooney’s concerns as well, though he thought the up-front payment would help alleviate the situation. But he noted that who gets that money is unclear. He thought the proposal needed to be tweaked.

Moderator Flynn noted that neither was it clear that program faculty could decide whether the plan was appropriate or not for them.

Mackelprang thought that requests would grow in number and increasingly make for heavy service loads for faculty in those programs doing this. The proposal did not seem to address this variability in service loads.

Mooney wondered, if the requests grew to a point where the chair decided they were taking too much faculty time and “decides to take care of themselves, so does that then take the curriculum so to speak out of the hands of the faculty . . . would that be a concern if a department chair decided to just take care of that himself?”

Williams-Johnson said the committee wants departments to have control and the ability, should requests become overwhelming, to stop participation.

Provost Bartels had a couple of points: Starting the program sets a precedent, so suddenly ceasing it could create the problem of students arguing about the cessation. Also, regarding the money, she suspected that tuition dollars couldn't just be sent somewhere other than the institution. She thought some compensation plan for faculty going above and beyond teaching and service requirements could be developed, but wasn't sure about that.

Anderson agreed the money issue needed more investigation. He thought Wayne Smith, who worked with the subcommittee on this, might have some answers as to how tuition is handled in other areas like CLEP or IB or AP at the undergraduate level, or in the program where we have military personnel coming off of active service who get some credits. As for opting out, the spirit of this was to have individual programs come up with policies of their own, and any changes that would have to happen thereafter would be done with the approval of the College of Graduate Studies to make sure that there was continuity and consistency in the policies; he said that was marked out in the proposal itself. He emphasized that the spirit of this is not to cheat programs out of student face time or one-on-one time, but to recognize that some students come in with the kind of knowledge that would make them exciting candidates for a program, but often we lose those students because they would have to re-take things that they may have already taken. So part of this initiative is recruitment.

Mackelprang suggested that the one-credit upfront be framed as a fee, with students then paying the standard tuition rate for any credits granted.

Moderator Flynn did not want to limit discussion, but said it sounded to him like this needed to go back to the committee for revision.

Anderson noted it was on their upcoming agenda and he would take with him the information from this meeting. He asked, for clarity's sake, for a list of concerns. Moderator Flynn said the two of them would sit down and work that out. Discussion raised a further concern: Whether students could make such requests only when entering a program, or after they had been here for some time.

Cyr noted that he had not heard much opposition to what Anderson called the "spirit" of the program, but much concern with the mechanics of the policy as proposed.

9. New Business

Parking and Transportation Representative Election:

Jake Simons (COBA) had volunteered. There were no more nominees and Simons was elected by acclamation.

Senate Representative to the Faculty Athletics Committee

There were three nominees: Kelly Berry (CLASS), who served on the committee last year; Ed Mondor (COSM); and Eric Landers (COE). Moderator Flynn asked them for statements.

Berry said he wanted to finish his second year of two-years; Landers said it sounded more exciting than Parking, but he was not married to it; Mondor said he had served on the committee before, knew NCAA representative Chris Geyerman really well, and opined that "They don't like having me on there because I ask a lot of questions about [*inaudible*] and where the money goes."

The candidates left the room and a vote was conducted by counting hands: Berry = 13, Landers = 4; and Mondor = 18. So Mondor was elected.

SGA Liaison

Current SGA Liaison Ellen Hamilton had volunteered to serve a second year. No other nominees came forward, and Teresa Thompson (Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management) said she believed students would revolt if they could not have Hamilton. Hamilton was elected by acclamation.

Parliamentarian:

Karen McCurdy offered to serve as Parliamentarian again. There were no other nominees. McCurdy was elected by acclamation.

10. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Moderator Flynn announced the meeting had moved on to announcements from vice-presidents, but Ming Fang He (COE) said she had a lot of questions, in three major groups, under New Business:

Question 1): Is Georgia Southern still an [Affirmative Action/Equity University](#)? If so, she believed our current work permit requirements exclude people of different nationalities; had they been in place 17 years ago, many international faculty, including herself, would not have been able to work here.

She offered to submit a formal Request for Discussion. Moderator Flynn suggested that would be a good idea. Ming Fang He said she would, but wanted to ask the questions and then submit a formal request for the next meeting.

Question 2): Do we have a [Title IX](#) officer at Georgia Southern? Who is she or he? What are the responsibilities of a Title IX officer? She was not clear at all what this person did.

Question 3): Does Georgia Southern deal with gun violence off campus involving Georgia Southern students? Could we use that kind of an incident as a teachable moment to continue to create safe environments for Georgia Southern and the surrounding communities?

Ming Fan He said she would submit a formal agenda request, but wanted the questions on the record.

There were no announcements from Vice-Presidents.

11. Announcements from the Floor

None

12. Adjournment

Moved and Approved.

Minutes submitted by Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary.

10-31-2016

10-31-2016 Faculty Senate Minutes

Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Georgia Southern University, "10-31-2016 Faculty Senate Minutes" (2016). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 28.
<http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/28>

This minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Faculty Senate Minutes
October 31, 2016
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Russell Union Ballroom

Voting members in attendance: (Clint Martin for Cheryl Aasheim); Lisa Abbott, Sam Adeyeye, Mete Akcaoglu, Rocio Alba-Flores, (Haresh Rochani for Moya Alfonso), Dragos Amarie, Sarah Bielski, (Jorge Suazo for Adam Bossler), Ted Brimeyer, (Manuela Caciula for Gavin Colquitt), Finbarr Curtis, Marc Cyr, Mark Edwards, Larisa Elisha, Richard Flynn, Tim Giles, Alice Hall, (Matthew Flynn for Eric Hall, Ming Fang He, Yi Hu, Alina Iacob, Bob Jackson, Scott Kersey, Mujibur Khan, Hsiang-Jui Kung, Alisa Leckie, (Jessica Garner for Lili Li), Jim LoBue, Lawrence Locker, Li Ma, (Chung-Yean Chiang for Allen Mackelprang), Ron MacKinnon, (Dolores Rangel for Leticia McGrath), Ed Mondor, Lowell Mooney, Constantin Ogloblin, Rob Pirro, Peter Rogers, Jake Simons, Fred Smith, Janice Steirn, James Stephens, Linda L. Thompson, Mark Welford, Tharanga Wickramarachchi, Meca Williams-Johnson

Voting members not in attendance: Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, Dustin Anderson, Kelly Berry, David Dudley, Ellen Hamilton, Jonathan Hilpert, Barbara King, Eric Landers, Santanu Majumdar, Chasen Smith, Valentin Soloiu, Sam Todd, Shijun Zheng

NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman

Senate Parliamentarian: Karen McCurdy

Student Government Association: Eudiah Ochieng

Administrators in Attendance: Jean Bartels, Martha Abell, Barry Joyner, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker

Visitors: William Amponsah, Richard Cleveland, Russell Thackston, Rebecca Ziegler, Chris Caplinger, Alicia Spence, Jason Slone

1. [Approval of the Agenda for the October 31, 2016 meeting.](#)

Moved and Approved.

2. [Approval of the September 6, 2016 Minutes: Marc Cyr \(CLASS\), Senate Secretary](#)

Moved and Approved.

3. Librarian's Reports for October, 2016, Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Librarian:

Moved and Approved.

Undergraduate Committee Report – Ron McKinnon (COBA), Chair:

Ron MacKinnon (COBA) noted the first business of the committee was to elect a chair, which turned out to be him. The 2016-2017 Undergraduate Committee Schedule was approved. They discussed Course Inventory Management (CIM), which will digitize all the documents they deal with, and he suggested that sometime in future the committee give an overview of that process to the faculty. The report was Moved and Approved.

Graduate Committee Report – Dustin Anderson (CLASS), Chair

Moderator Flynn (CLASS) noted that, as a member of this committee, he would give the report in place of committee Chair Dustin Anderson, who was in class. The committee discussed three topics, along with electing the chair and approving the 2016-2017 Meeting Schedule. There were two updates: The chair provided an update on the Faculty Senate's comments on the Prior Learning Assessment proposal, and the PLA subcommittee agreed to reconvene to address the concerns voiced at the September Faculty Senate meeting. The subcommittee would revise the proposal into a policy to be submitted later to the Graduate Committee for approval before delivery to the Senate. The chair also provided a brief update on upcoming comprehensive program reviews, including a new review matrix required by the University System of Georgia. In new business, the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs presented an item regarding Graduate Faculty Status. The proposal outlined a method of conferring graduate faculty status upon appointment to Georgia Southern University based on the recommendation of that faculty member's Dean and Department Chair. The committee moved to accept this method and requested the policy be revised and submitted to the committee for approval. The committee also requested the VPAA office address the method by which existing faculty would receive Graduate Faculty Status. In old business, in light of the VPAA's proposal for a new method of Graduate Faculty Status, the committee moved to check the previously tabled business item regarding changes to the College of Graduate Studies policy and forms for approving Graduate Faculty Status. The committee requested these items be submitted for approval of the President. The committee's report was Moved and Approved.

Core Curriculum and General Education Committee, Michelle Cawthorn

No report.

4. President's Report (Jaimie Hebert)

President Hebert was absent and had asked Moderator Flynn to report on three items.

Enrollment

Enrollment is up 1% in terms of headcount and up 2.2% in semester credit hours, the latter statistic meaning that more people are participating as full-time students.

Provost's Search

Flynn, a member of the search committee, asked Teresa Thompson, who is the Chair of the Search Committee, to give an update.

VP Thompson (Student Affairs and Enrollment Management) said the President charged the committee, and the committee recommended that we utilize a search firm so that we could broaden the pool of applicants and diversity, which we will do. Also, each member of the committee was asked to provide two to four sentences describing what they would be looking for in a Provost, so that that could be added to the ad going out in the next week or so.

Moderator Flynn added that while they voted to use the search firm, they also voted that the committee be the ones reading all the CV's and letters, so the search firm will not filter for them.

Rob Pirro (CLASS) asked if the faculty and staff of the University had been officially notified of this search yet by email or some other means. Flynn said they were waiting for one additional member to be appointed before the committee is announced publicly.

Strategic Planning Process

In early spring we will begin our strategic planning process, starting with working on a vision and after that the plan to get us there.

5. Provost's Report: (Jean Bartels)

The Military Science Building should be completed by the end of November.

The plans for the Interdisciplinary Classroom Building that will be located between Carroll and CEIT Buildings were underway. Plans had been approved and submitted by

the architects, and the building groups selected, and groundbreaking should happen during Christmas break or in January. There will be some demolition of buildings that are on the site. Construction will block off some current parking space, but faculty will not lose spaces because some of the student parking in that area will be relocated. There also will be some walkway impediments for direct cut-through to get onto the pedestrian, but there will be signage to help in navigating the area.

As for the building, there will be several larger classrooms, as well as relocation of some of the displaced people, those from Forest Drive Building in particular, since that will be disappearing as well. In December, there will be a number of moves: CHHS departments are going to be moved to the old Student Health Sciences, Health Services Building, which has been renovated and will be able to be used as swing space during construction. ROTC will move into their new building. Academic Affairs will return to its remodeled location in Pittman on the second floor.

Rob Pirro (CLASS) asked Provost Bartels if it was strange procedure that the official announcement of a search was going to come at some indiscernible time in the future, while the search is already underway.

Provost Bartels noted she was not a party to the search process in any way, and the announcement about the search committee really is the President's to make, but the President did announce at a senate meeting that the search would begin shortly. She thought Pirro's question would be a good one for the President.

[Secretary's Note: Some voices cannot be heard at this point in the recording, but a question was asked about moving December commencement outside to Paulson Stadium.]

Provost Bartels said that one of the primary drivers for it was logistics. We have too few seats in Hanner because of the success of our graduation numbers to accommodate all of the people who need and want to be part of the graduation ceremony, even with severe restrictions, and even with more than three graduation ceremonies. The Student Government Association did some surveying, and had several thousand responses requesting that the ceremony be moved, so that was the basis for the decision by the President's Cabinet and the President.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) noted that Hanner would still serve as a rain location, and that in the event of needing to move to Hanner then the students would need tickets for their guests and would be limited to four. She asked if students would be told to go ahead and choose their four or get their tickets as a contingency plan, because they won't be able to do it at the last minute.

Provost Bartels said they would, and that it is the same process as used in May. She noted that those without tickets could use multiple places where they can observe the ceremony, such as Nessmith-Lane and the Union, then join up for celebration afterwards. She noted it is not unusual for some families to want 25 people as guests, and that a limit of 4 was not popular. She gave credit here to what VP Thompson and her people in Student Affairs have done over the years, but we got to the point where even parents weren't able to get seats. We have become a victim of our own success, and breaking into seven/eight different conferrals would not solve the problem either and would cost the University a significant amount of money that would then not be available for the other things.

[Secretary's Note: Again, speakers cannot be heard, but a question was asked about why faculty were not consulted about this move of the ceremony.]

Moderator Flynn said it never would have occurred to him that he should be asked about this decision, that since the day hasn't changed he can't see how this would inconvenience any faculty, and didn't really see what there was to discuss about it.

Rob Pirro (CLASS) said he thought it would have been "smart institutionally to include the faculty" in the discussion because they are obligated to attend this ceremony and it is a different, longer ceremony, and at just the last Senate meeting we had had questions about how faculty weren't getting grades in on time. This may cause more problems in that respect. But he called this a "process question," and faculty discussion would have avoided "a needless alienation of some faculty members." He had heard from many that they felt left out.

Mark Edwards (COSM) did not mind not being asked about the change, but thought the valid reasons for it should have been announced at the same time the change was, but there was no explanation in the announcement email.

Moderator Flynn recalled that the question of tickets was mentioned, and there was a story about it in the *George-Anne*. Edwards responded that the announcement had been two weeks ago and had not mentioned reasons.

[Secretary's Note: Again, a portion of the recording is inaudible, but a question was asked about commencement speakers.]

Provost Bartels said no official invitations to speakers had yet been given. Moderator Flynn thought faculty should have input on choosing graduation speakers. Provost Bartels noted that "we do not pay our speakers to come, so all those great ideas you have

about wonderful people that would speak, would be out of our league to probably invite.”

6. Senate Executive Committee Report: Richard Flynn [CLASS], Chair.

There was one Motion on the agenda: This was from Chris Caplinger on changes to the early alert system, which was sent to the Academic Standards Committee because such proposals generally go to that committee. The Academic Standards Committee supported items 1, 3 and 4 but had two objections to item #2. The first was that it wasn't worded clearly regarding whether students were going to get a notification telling them that they were not receiving the alert; Caplinger clarified that language for the revised motion that was posted on the Senate site. Flynn noted that we have a standing order for a projector for Senate meetings, and he had planned to put up the revised motion, but no projector had been provided. The second objection was that some of the committee, and it was a 6-3 vote, thought that it was too much work for faculty.

There was also a discussion item from the Henderson Library Committee about potential cancellation of subscriptions.

Finally, the previous week Flynn had attended the USG Faculty Council meeting. Among those gathered were incoming Chancellor Wrigley; Michael Crafton, the Interim Chief Academic Officer; and Marti Venn, Deputy Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Among items discussed was the Presidential Search for Kennesaw, and problems with consolidations. Flynn thought “that not much light was shed on those things,” but he would provide a link to the minutes when they are published. They did say that the default for Presidential appointments is that we do a search rather than directly appoint presidents, but discussion revealed that about a third of the presidents in the University System were direct appointments right now, so many of the faculty members there complained about having no voice in that process and no voice in the process of consolidations. The representative from Armstrong, who that morning found out that her president was retiring, said she didn't want to become Georgia Southern Lite. Regarding changes to the health benefits, they are now having a fixed amount of money that they're going to contribute towards whichever plan you choose. He guessed this was similar to, though maybe not quite as bad as what goes on for retirees since retirees have to shop for their health care on the exchange. There was some talk about whether schools had active programs to help employees make good transitions into retirement. They also found out that there's been a 244% increase in part-time faculty members throughout the System. There was discussion about diversity problems; about the new categories of institutions, including how what is called the dual function of certain institutions affects promotion and tenure; and about the invalidity of the 33⅓ salary cap

for summer work since it apparently is no longer a federal requirement. And so the council voted to have somebody draft something to send to the Board of Regents about that.

Fred Smith (LIB) asked over what time period this 244% increase in part-time faculty occurred. Flynn did not have that in his notes, but did not think it was longer than five years. It would be in the USGFC minutes.

Rob Pirro (CLASS) asked if the health insurance change was already in place or was coming up. Flynn was not sure, but said they would contribute \$413.03 a month no matter what plan you were on. He also noted a significant decrease in support for dependents, but didn't have the numbers. Nobody at the USGFC meeting was happy about these issues.

7. Motion on [Early Alerts Changes](#)

Chris Caplinger (Director, First-Year Experience): After Academic Standards met, he called that committee's chair, Bill Levernier, to ask for clarification about what he'd like to see going forward because the committee had expressed some concerns about not really knowing exactly what the provision that they voted down was about. Caplinger offered clarification and asked if Levernier wanted to take that back to Academic Standards, but Levernier said he thought it best to go directly to the Senate. There are four provisions in the motion:

- A name change from "early alerts" to "academic alerts" to reduce the confusion with other types of alerts, such as "Eagle Alerts."
- The big change is from issuing alerts based on the student's classification as a freshman student, to making it automatic for all students who are in core courses, Areas A-E, or in any other courses that departments would opt into, and they would have the opportunity to do that annually by April 1.
- Parts 3 and 4 are subsets of 2, identifying courses subject to the alert process.

[Secretary's Note: Janice Steirn (CLASS) spoke, but is inaudible. It was about non-freshmen already knowing how they are doing in their classes.]

Mark Edwards (COSM), a member of the Academic Standards Committee, said they had discussed this and the key point isn't that students don't know that they aren't doing well, but that the alert "mobilizes infrastructure because some students know that they are not doing well, but they can't do anything about it. They're depressed. They're

financially strapped and there are outfits at the University that can help them, but they won't help them unless they know about it, and that's what the alert is for."

Rob Pirro (CLASS) asked Provost Bartels what happens when an alert goes out.

Provost Bartels said we "have begun to implement across all of the colleges' advising centers, intervention advisors, so this is a place where that information goes so that they actually can identify and know which students are having difficulty and then make appropriate appointments with them to bring them in, talk to them and try to figure out what the problems are. Get them directed to resources that might be helpful." Caplinger added that the alert also goes to others, including those in the Academic Success Center. And the proposal would make it "a real alert." Currently, at mid-term students actually have to check to see if they have an alert, and they haven't been doing that. With the proposed system, it will grey out the back of their screen when they log into myGeorgiaSouthern and say in text that they have an early alert posted for a course and the reason for that alert. This was designed by a group of faculty.

Moderator Flynn noted that currently, when he issued alerts, he has an option to mark everybody S, and asked if that option would remain, thus saving the time of people who have 300 students or so.

Caplinger said that option would remain, allowing faculty to mark all as No Alert and then only changing those that need an alert, and they were working with the IT folks to alter the program so that one click, instead of two, would be needed for each student alert. They are also looking at other ways to streamline the process.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) said that is only part of the issue. Before any clicking, faculty like her may have to review 300 grades because she was not aware of how each student is doing in her large classes.

Provost Bartels said one major concern is our Complete College Georgia work in terms of retention of students, with students not necessarily understanding where they stood, nor getting the kind of attention that they might need or the direction they might need if they were having difficulties, so this also is intended to improve our retention rates. She noted a plethora of literature about how this kind of early intervention actually does make a difference in retaining students and correcting their poor performances. Our retention rates beyond the freshman are still not so good. Her personal and professional opinion was that, in a place that prides itself rightfully on being student-centered, this was an important step for us to take in terms of making sure that we are assisting students in a timely fashion so they can be successful in their work.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that at any time before end-of-term the best he can do is give a guesstimate as to whether students are okay or not. He also noted that it was 5-6 weeks into a term before he had enough grades in to make that guesstimate, and asked how early “early” would be.

Caplinger understood concerns about how accurate such an early grade could be and whether it can be accurately predictive, but the concept of an early alert based on something not being turned in or poor attendance or other legitimate reasons is “a shot across the bow of students to say this type of behavior or this type of performance is not going to bode well.” It will have no permanent grade impact but might help turn things around.

Cyr favored the proposal, but was concerned that too early a date might drive him to alter his curriculum to suit the date, and he thought that was the reverse of how things should work. So he wanted to know how “early” the deadline would be.

Caplinger said that would remain as it is now, the 34th calendar day of the regular Fall or Spring term. He noted that even earlier, if a problem is detected, would be better.

[Secretary’s Note: Jake Simons (COBA) spoke but is inaudible except for his name, though it seems to have been about classes outside areas A-E.]

Caplinger did not know how many departments would opt in, but just A-E would increase the students helped, and while that number was knowable, but he would have to work it out. He added that the proposal would also fix the current problem of faculty wanting to alert some students but being unable to do so because they have sophomore status. The same frustration can occur when there is a student with freshman classification in an upper division course.

[Secretary’s Note: Lowell Mooney (COBA) spoke but beyond his name is inaudible, but it seems to have to do with faculty setting even earlier dates for themselves.]

Caplinger thought faculty could set those dates for themselves and “do it again closer to that thirty-fourth day.”

Mujibur Khan (CEIT) said his experience was that these kinds of student are doing badly not because of some academic reason, but for reasons that lie somewhere else. He asked if guardians or parents would be alerted as well because frequently it is family reasons that are involved. Moderator Flynn noted that that is against the FIRPA law, though Caplinger noted that students can give permission for such communication.

[Secretary's Note: There is an inaudible patch here in the recording.]

Cyr noted that issues like depression and financial stress mentioned by Edwards are not confined to freshmen, and he had seniors in his core classes who needed lots of help. Caplinger noted that the group that developed the proposal considered that situation and this was one reason for designating A-E classes for reporting because in some senior classes there is no early grade on which to base an alert. Pirro noted that strategy left freshmen in upper division courses out of the net. Caplinger thought those numbers were small, and that advising needed to take that into consideration for freshmen who might benefit from greater oversight.

[Secretary's Note: Janice Steirn (CLASS) spoke, but beyond her name is inaudible.]

Moderator Flynn asked to move the motion to a vote. It was Moved and Seconded. Then Ted Brimeyer (CLASS) asked if there was a quorum present because there have been cases where the validity of such votes on policy was questioned later when a quorum might not have been present. Counts were done and a quorum was present. The motion was Approved.

8. Discussion Item from [Henderson Library Committee](#)

Russell Thackston (CEIT) spoke as a representative of the University Library Committee. He distributed a [fact sheet](#) for the project he was there to discuss. The Library will conduct a review of the electronic subscriptions we have on campus to see which are either no or low-use, and which might be considered low impact in order to identify candidates for subscriptions “that can be moved . . .” They’re avoiding the word “cancelled” because such items will “move” from being instant online to available via Interlibrary Loans. You’ll still be able to get most of the materials you are looking for, it just may take up to four or five days for it to come in paper form from another library. The Library has reviewed the current subscriptions and there are some journals or databases that have not been accessed over the last year, and some have been accessed a very few times at a very high cost per access. They will send out to each of the colleges a list of what they see as the 150 lowest accessed publications or databases. The Deans will pass that on to the Department Chairs to solicit feedback from their faculty. They want faculty to drive this project. The Library wants to know what databases faculty find critical to both their academic programs and individual research activities, and want faculty to justify keeping them. The Library will then be able to determine if there are any “undefended” and switch them to an interlibrary loan model. The reason is budgetary. Right now we are about \$900,000 in deficit for the Library budget for those particular items. Since the 1970s electronic subscriptions have gone up about 6% a year

and our funding has not kept pace. In previous years, the University has covered that budget shortfall through year-end money, but that amount is unknown until we get to the end-of-the-year and so no amount is guaranteed. The deficit is so large this year the Library doesn't want to wait on uncertain funding and also be unable to get feedback from the faculty on this. Also, the survey that went out a few months back on the Library and the quality of services they provide found that the largest area of dissatisfaction among faculty was the information resources that were being provided. So in order to address that, we're either going to need more funding or we're going to have to adjust existing funding. He added that the Library might make this a regular procedure for the sake of fiscal responsibility to taxpayers to make sure that we are not subscribing to things that aren't needed or that aren't being used regularly.

[Secretary's Note: There was an inaudible question.]

Thackston said they didn't want to make any assumptions about what a department may be using, so they're going to start off with 150 of the least used, or highest cost per use subscriptions, and everybody will get the same list to start with. He noted that the Library could provide, if it is wanted, the full list of the more than 800 subscriptions we have for the University. Some very obviously are not going to get cut; they are used tens of thousands of times a year.

Moderator Flynn recommended that Senators read the Library report in the Senate Librarian's Report because there is a chart in there that shows that, compared to our peer institutions, we have a very low per FTE expenditure. The lowest on the list. He thought it might be an appropriate factor to consider how underfunded our Library is when we are making these decisions.

Ming Fang He (COE) praised the Library as an important academic foundation of the University and praised the job being done by Dean Mitchell. She asked Provost Bartels if it would be possible to maintain or increase the end-of-year money that goes to the Library.

Provost Bartels said that giving end-of-year money to the Library is routine, the amount is usually significant, and GSU always looks for ways to increase that funding. She had already asked that for the 2018 budget we think about formalizing some part of that so that it is consistent. She added that the low-funding number might be misleading and asked Dean Mitchell to comment.

Dean Bede Mitchell (LIB) noted that we are thirteenth out of fourteen in per FTE student spending in the Library, and twelfth out of fourteen in terms of total budget.

Our so-called peers actually are much better funded than our institution is. Moderator Flynn asked if he meant “our institutions as a whole,” and Dean Mitchell said yes.

Matthew Flynn (CLASS) asked what our savings would be if we move those 150 subscriptions from direct access to the interlibrary loan model format.

Thackston said the goal is to not to target a dollar amount, but to actually target the subscriptions that are not defended/justified by departments. A dollar target might end up with the cutting of something that is considered critical. The goal is to remove what is obviously easy to take out and then look for year-end money to make up the difference.

Moderator Flynn noted that some research sources have tiers of service that include certain journals, so you can’t go journal by journal. He felt that already our tier of service isn’t high enough. How would the Library make that kind of decision?

Dean Mitchell (LIB) noted such sources have such high usage figures that they will not be on the list.

Li Ma (COSM) asked if we will be able to maintain the response time for interlibrary loans. Thackston said there will probably be an increase in the amount of work that the Library has to do for interlibrary loans. He also thought that increase might not be as much as it appears because some people might decide an item isn’t all that urgent and not put in an ILL request. Whatever, they believed they could “keep up to a point with the increase in requests coming in.”

Moderator Flynn foresaw a problem with students getting needed items for their papers via ILL since he already has a hard time motivating them to do so.

9. Unfinished Business

NCAA Sanctions: Chris Geyerman, Faculty Athletic Representative, answering questions posed by Marc Cyr ([link to questions here](#)) re: [Geyerman’s report included in the Librarian’s Report for October 2016](#) ([Link to Transcript](#)--[Link to Recording](#)-These may need to be shared with you since they are on Google Drive.)

[Secretary’s Note: FAR Geyerman requested – see below, bottom of page 14 – that his remarks be included verbatim in these minutes. Barring a couple of points where I messed up the formatting and couldn’t figure out how to reverse it, they are presented here unaltered from the transcript except that I have put them in bold to differentiate them from the edited sections spoken by others. As with all Senate meetings since at least 2013, the recording and transcript

are available online or by request from Ginger Malphrus – no Freedom of Information request required – for anyone who wants to check the validity of the minutes.]

Chris Geyerman (CLASS): Thank you, Richard, and my colleagues on the Senate. I'm happy to be here. One of the main things that I think is frustrating people right now with my responses was my refusal to give responses that could not be grounded in facts. My academic training taught me when I am reporting to report only facts, not opinions, not evaluations, and not inferences, and that's exactly what I tried to do. And that's exactly what I will do every time I'm on any committee or any official endeavor for the University that requires reporting, but by me personally on behalf of any committee or on behalf of the University or any group it's affiliated with. Now, I have a suggestion that I think I can do that will clarify it will give Marc answers to what I think he was getting at with his questions. I won't have to pass them off as fact because they will not be factual responses; they will be nothing more than my opinions as the faculty member closest to this investigation based on what I gleaned from the process. Obviously, my memory at the beginning of the process will be much fuzzier than it will at the end of the process because of the length of the process which is point out periodically throughout the back and forth between Marc and I. But what I will request and I would like some folks to weigh in on that is that make sure everyone in this room right now is absolutely fine with me giving my opinion because I do have four examples:

- **On RE: page 1 —** Why did the NCAA Committee on Infractions panel reject the initial Summary Disposition Report made by Georgia Southern? I put unable to verify response, and put the recording of my telephone call to the NCAA. I don't know why they did that, and they won't tell me, so I can only give my opinion. There is no basis in fact for that. I have definite ideas on why they did, but those ideas are only opinions, so what I respectfully request ~~from my sentence~~ from my colleagues in the Senate is to proceed responding and I'll go through and every one of them with my opinion and see if that addresses the questions that are asked.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said he had asked for facts, such as whether we asked the NCAA their reasons, and didn't ask for Geyerman's opinions.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: With all due respect, the question, and I quote your question: "Why did the NCAA Committee on Infractions reject the Initial Summary Disposition Report

made by Georgia Southern?” There is no way to answer that question in fact if the people that authored the report will not talk to you and tell you why.

Cyr said he had asked for a fact, that is, whether we inquired why the report was rejected, or we just accepted the rejection and dropped the matter.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: Those questions you just mentioned came to me Friday afternoon. This is the first time I’ve had an opportunity to address those questions, and I will address those as well, as I go through this. But they will be all addressed and they will be with my best guess. I cannot get facts, but I will tell you the questions that require facts, Marc, I’ll be happy, if I know what the facts are to share them.

Cyr said that was part of his problem, that the Athletics Department didn’t know much and didn’t want to know much. He was concerned that we do not have a culture of compliance in Athletics because we have the same problem recurring since 2007 of our employees cheating for students.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: I understood that, and I read that, and I will address it as I go through. I’m going to go through it from RE, your RE page 1, all the way through the correspondence, systematically.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: Okay. Is there anyone out there that doesn’t have the documents, because one of the things I did in preparation for this was I merged the initial report for this meeting with the document that Dr. Cyr sent around on Friday afternoon so that for example RE page 1, you have my response and then the stuff that came in on Friday right there in the same, it’s all merged together. All I’ve done is cut and paste. I haven’t edited a thing. I’ll be happy to pass those out if you folks would like them.

Moderator Flynn asked him to do so.

(Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: I can send a paper bill to AD Kleinlein maybe. Do all of my colleagues have one? There’s some left over. Okay, I respectfully request that I be allowed to go through this uninterrupted so that all of my responses can be completed before we begin any further discussion. I’ll go as fast as I can, and that my, not report, and that my opinions be recorded in the minutes to this meeting verbatim.

Moderator Flynn said that would be on the assumption that the recording worked.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: Good point.

Mark Edwards (COSM) pointed out that Marc Cyr was the Senate Secretary.

Cyr said he would “put them in pretty much verbatim anyway,” but might clean up some of the grammar.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: I would appreciate it being known as someone that can occasionally have bad grammar and have them go in verbatim. Now if those of you that know me well, know that in private life I do not talk like a quaker and if there’s something along those regards that slips out by all means feel free that, but I would like them in verbatim.

Page 1 Re: page 1, Why did the NCAA Committee on Infractions reject the initial Summary Disposition Report made by Georgia Southern?

In my opinion, it’s because primarily why they rejected that was we were caught in a transition in re-organization with the NCAA and I believe it’s my opinion that the Committee on Infractions and the Committee on Enforcement were engaged in dialogue to define territory, and we got caught up in that, and that they wanted to have a public hearing so that they could begin to establish precedent for the rules on academic misconduct versus impermissible benefit that were passed in April and became effective on August 1, 2016. As for the other questions, all the ones that we asked, no we didn’t. We absolutely did not and I wouldn’t have at the time. I wouldn’t advocated it. The representative from the compliance group wouldn’t have advocated it. It’s a courtesy that they allow institutions to kind of make a petition for a summary disposition and the Committee on Infractions is certainly free to reject that and require a hearing, and that’s exactly what happened. All of the folks in the room I believe that it would be a total waste of time and they’ve all worked with the NCAA in particular the compliance counsel that we hired has over a 20-year enforcement career working in the Committee on Enforcement with the NCAA, so he’s very familiar with all of that.

- **Page 2: Let's see where, and the dispute was over Bylaw 10.1b,) Knowing involvement in arranging for fraudulent academic credit or false transcripts.**
- **Questions 2-5: Serious responses Questions 2-5. Okay, again, the NCAA did not comment, but throughout the process did we never ask these questions? No we didn't. Did the outside counsel asked these questions? No, or make representations to the NCAA about why we should not be hit with more penalties? That doesn't even make sense, because they don't announce the penalties until the public decision is posed, rendered, and at that point they won't talk to you about them, and if someone's going to penalize me and I know what the penalty is I'm probably not going to ask them why is it isn't more severe than it actually is. I'm probably just going to take the penalty as it is. Would that not require knowledge of what does and does not constitute grounds for various penalties? Probably not in my opinion, and these people are our hired counselors-not the NCAA-what do they say in this regard? Again, with their vast experience I have no reason to doubt that the guidance they gave us wasn't right on the money. There doesn't seem to be much of a desire on the part of our Athlet, oh, that's an opinion, okay, I'll move on.**
- **Response #6: OK.**
- **Re: page 2, Regarding the case of the Assistant Athletic Director of Student Services, How did she obtain the student athletes' usernames and passwords?**
- **The Other Response 6: You get two humanities people and between Marc and I we illustrated that one of us can't count and one of us can't number, so that goes with the turf I guess. How did she obtain? And I put unknown. Serious response. This response states that is is unknown, my guess is she asked. That's what my guess is. It's just a wild guess. She's working with these student athletes and you know the response states, I agree that it's not a res, a faculty response to the question, but I don't believe in my opinion the analogy about robbing a bank and obtaining a student's password doesn't hold much water either. The strength of analogy rests in this similarity of the two things being compared. If this is where that is. Yeah, it, I just don't believe robbing banks and obtaining a student's password are suitably**

similar for an analogy. And even if we know how banks are robbed and they still get robbed, so the analogy breaks down there anyhow.

- **Page 2:** The first case began on September 16, 2013, but was not reported to the NCAA until February 10, 2014 (after the football season was over). Why so long? The implicit premise grounding this question has no basis in fact. In fact, the COA, COI on page 10 of its July 7, 2016 published the decision listed “prompt self-detected and self-disclosed violations and affirmative steps to expedite the final solution of the matters two of the four mitigated factors for the institution. Serious response: FAR Geyerman says my question about why a case began on September 16, 2013 and was not reported to the NCAA until February 10, 2014 (after the football season was over) has an implicit premise that has no basis in fact. In fact, that’s not what my, whay my response said. It says it has an implicit premise grounding the question that has no basis in fact. There is a very subtle, yet critical difference there. Marc **and I ???** will be happy to give my views on that, if someone wants them. Serious Response continued, I would like to point out that the dates on which the question is based are facts. I agree with that, but they don’t serve as the grounds for the question, so there is a basis in fact for the question, but perhaps he is disputing my implicit characterization of this five month gap between the violation and the report of the violation as long because he then cites the NCAA characterization blah, blah, blah. Marc goes on then to say the only fact in FAR Geyerman’s rationale is that NCAA opinion Re: What is prompt and not prompt for expeditiously. That is not what I offered up as a basis statement of fact. I will repeat what I offered up as a statement of fact. In fact, the COI on page 10 of the July 7, 2016 public decision listed blah, blah, blah, the definition of a fact is that it must be verifiable. If you turn to 10 pages of that report that’s exactly what it says. Thus, it meets the criteria for being a fact, whether or not one agrees with the characterizations of expeditious, etc., is a matter of opinion not a matter of fact. The fact remains they appear on page 10 of the NCAA Violation. Then after we get a Geology lesson, we go to but maybe what the NCAA is actually referring to so now we are into hypothetical land, but maybe what the NCAA actually is referring to is not in its blah, blah, blah and then at the very end, but why then is the case was in this state of preparation in just three days did it take five months later to report it? So we’ve gone from facts to a maybe and then based the question on that. And I can clarify quite easily I believe that in my

opinion the cases are mixed up. The three day case refers to the time it took the institution to marshal the evidence sufficient to terminate the employment of person involved. The other case refers to the entire case I believe that we were preparing for the NCAA.

- **Re: page 2, The report notes that is this the instance specified on page six, I, I couldn't answer that, but I can give you my opinion on those for sure. The report notes that the enforcement staff requested records, let's see this is the one (someone coughed right when he was speaking and I could not hear what was said) right? We are told that, if so a bird went where, question, we are told, is this, I believe it is. I believe it is. Yes, I do. That is my opinion. I believe it is that. What was this other matter? The employee in question some of the people that were working in that office notified their supervisor that this employee they thought they overheard offering to give a ride to the student-athletes to a camp. That is a minor, but an NCAA violation, so that would have been an NCAA violation and there were other things that play, too, that aren't even in the report that surfaced right about this same time that this employee was writing professors asking for extra credit, etc., which the Director of Student-Athlete Services needless to say frowns on.**
- **Page 2: Okay, here's response, FAR Geyerman cites the unwillingness, however, the questions asked for information, the question didn't ask for institution, it begins with the premise that report notes that.**
- **Page 2: The report notes that GSU fired the assistant director of student-athlete services on February 19, 2015, and okay, that one is done.**
- **Page 4: Re: page 4, We are told that student-athlete admitted that he and the former assistant compliance director became social friends. What does social friends mean in this particular case? Only Marc, rhetorical question**

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: A rhetorical question in this particular response I think in my opinion is the kind of employee-student relationship that especially, well, I won't, that many folks would deem inappropriate. That's a personal-social relationship. I think I've made my point. The NCAA report states in regard to the case of assistant director of student services, she wrote and submitted were two

questions here: First, had the professor pursued charges against the students would this have caused the charge against the institution to rise? I don't believe so. I don't believe so at all. For lots of different reasons that I could talk about. If so, did our institution make the professor aware of his decision that he would be helping the institution avoid more serious penalties if he did not pursue? There are so many assumptions in that question. I can't even begin to unpack them. I will tell you that Assistant Provost Allen Woodrum and I reached out to this professor because we wanted to inform this professor that there was a chance he could be getting called to testify, not testify, interviewed by folks from the NCAA if they were to come on campus, and we wanted him to have a heads-up. We notified him of the academic dishonesty and told him in no uncertain terms to proceed as he would with every other student and I let him know if anyone from Athletics contacts him in any way to let me know immediately and I will push that up the line and I will say that to all of you right now. If anyone from Athletics, not student-athlete services, because the director may reach out to you to say thank you for filling out a form, or the director may have some questions, but if a coach ever calls, that's not Athletic policy. Let folks know. We'll get that rectified right away. Serious responses: see comments above. Okay. The NCAA will not comment. Did our counsel never ask these questions. Oh, I left out one. I will not presume to speak for Georgia Southern or the NCAA and Marc said I could ask those people. I'm not going to call the NCAA and ask them to make a Senate appearance even via email. They will blow me off. I have no doubt about that. You know, in all of us are free to ask the only institutional representative to speak for Georgia Southern to speak to that. It is not me.

- **Appendix One: I have several questions regarding this list of Corrective Actions as taken.**
 - **Why does the compliance office still report to Business and Finance? I guess the powers that be, I'm assuming, my opinion is that that's the best place for it. I happen to agree. I don't think it's an academic affair.**
 - **When we established the office of student-athlete services, did the tutoring and all of that kind of stuff that in my mind and we didn't have one until then was most definitely an academic affair, and I suggested to our new, then new athletic director, in fairly certain terms, that that was my opinion. He agreed and that's the story there.**
 - **Why, I don't think it would be in my opinion, a good fit for student affairs, is they have to do the compliance office, has to**

monitor a lot more than just academic misconduct. They have to monitor coaching, practice times, and CARA (countable athletic related activities) and a host of other things that clearly are non-academic. It's more kind of a similar to an HR function, actually, when they have to lots of different rules and HR reports in the Business and Finance line as well. Good. Glad to hear it. Compliance is off???. Six says we are in compliance then in this case it's JumpForward and then Serious response: A compliance vendor is a software program and my million years. I provided the link anybody can go study that as much as they want to answer any questions that they want. So by all means do and you know I think that would be great.

- **Suggestion for Further Corrective Action:** I find this suggestion in my opinion it's both presumptuous and arrogant. It's presumptuous in the fact that it's not typical to make suggested corrective actions in units that we have never, that we don't have much knowledge of and I think it's arrogant to think that we are qualified to make those kinds of suggestions without ever having taken the time to walk across campus and talk to the folks and find out how they operate. I hope we don't teach our students that the proper way to go about listing a corrective action is to read a report from a party that's never talked to the unit or body that were making the corrective action with respect to and then making that corrective action without ever, without ever even talking or finding out about the place, or the activities to which we're making the corrective action.
- **General Query:** The cases began in September 2013 and concluded in July 2016, a period of time. This seems to me unconscionably long time frame. I can't verify the unconsciously part. It seemed really long to me, too. I can't tell y'all how many times I stopped by compliance and asked the compliance coordinator have we heard anything yet? I have some, I thought I jotted it down. For example, and this is one that I missed. It started in September 2013. The NCAA, excuse me, Committee on Enforcement conducted their last interview in the investigative process with this student-athlete on November 17, 2014. That's the NCAA. They took 12 months plus I guess 13, 14 months to conduct their and when you're in that situation and you're waiting on them before you can respond and they don't respond, there's not a whole lot you can do, so do

I think it took a long time, yes, trust me, I wish it would have been taken care of real quick. Would have made my life personally a lot better, but it wasn't. There was a back and forth between the Committee on Enforcement and the Committee on Infractions for six months regarding Bylaw 10.1b. Where we were sitting in limbo. So that, those are some of the reasons, I think, at least, in my opinion. Okay. Yes, the suggestion that Marc offered up for the office is exactly what's going, that's exactly the policy and that's verified by the appropriate people.

- Marc's General Query: The compliance with the penalty. I really appreciate Marc in bringing that to my attention. And I acted on it immediately, and it got taken care of, and I think Senator Mondor can testify to how much I appreciate that, if he remembers and I have a feeling that he does because the students ??? Three years ago, Ed called me up, this was after he just rotated off University Athletic Committee and said hey, Chris, I'm freaking out, I think we've got a student-athlete that might be competing ineligibly because of a credit hour situation and I wanted to reach out to you and find out what you know about it, and if that's true. Please, I, I, I, my recollection of that conversation, it was a telephone conversation, I got right on it, and I got back to Ed and at the end. Ed said well I didn't really want to buy it and I didn't want to bother you, that's not the word he used, but I don't want to be a pain in the butt and I believe I told Ed, Ed I appreciate you doing this. I wish we had more faculty members that are as attuned to the situation as you are. So any time faculty members have something that they think will be helpful I am all ears in terms of especially compliance. Okay, if you could go to page 7, page 2, I do believe we have a culture of compliance. We have different definitions of a culture of compliance I believe. I go by the NCAA's definition of culture of compliance. What we always hear in these seminars, does the institution have procedures and policies in place to sufficiently monitor what's going on, detect violations, and report them in a timely manner and carry out the investigations. They don't focus on prevention; they understand we report, every institution, I'm guessing, reports several minor violations, every year. You know, so that's to be expected, but I do believe because the employees in the office are the ones that picked up on it. Because Assistant Provost Woodrum and I went to the faculty member and informed

them, not the other way around. To me that speaks of a system, a culture of compliance. Okay, we get the Press Release from the AD, I don't think it was ever intended like that. Here's my opinion of what happened. The compliance office called the sports information office and said we need to get this up there and he just took that press release. In my opinion, it was never intended for use like that. And that getting that up there was something we had to do and we had to do right away. Marc was kind enough to characterize me as a nice guy and note that people think I'm a nice guy, which I appreciated, but for the three days after, 2 1/2 days whatever it was about my, there were people in Athletics that I think would dispute that characterization. Nonetheless, that has to be done as does the monitoring for 9E. That's one and I appreciate that suggestion as well. I had already long before this meeting with, right after this happened I went to the compliance and I said we need to be sure to reporting our progress on this to the University Athletics Committee at our meetings, so that there's a track record when we get audited for compliance. Marc's suggestion made me think of one additional step I can take and I thank him for that and that is, is Eric [Hall] here he is the chair of the committee, no, our numbers are dwindling and that is to be included as a standard agenda item until we are off probation, full-well recognizing that oftentimes the compliance director will say I have nothing new to report, but at least having it be there, so I plan on doing that. Finally, at the end, Marc says FAR Geyerman sees sunshine in the fact that since 2007, I find it in a report to colleagues again remarkably presumptuous and remarkably arrogant to speak for how any of other human being sees the world. I don't even think most people know how they see the world. And I think it is an extremely poor collegiality to do that publicly and in front of one's peers when they know that this is an ongoing process. And I wanted to go on record as letting everyone know that I do not appreciate that and in my humble opinion I think Marc that you owe me a public apology.

Cyr said he owed no apology because he was referring to Geyerman's opinion that we have "a culture of compliance," and objected to being called arrogant.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: I did not say that. I said the response demonstrated presumptuous and arrogant, I did not call you arrogant.

Cyr thanked him and began a remark about “the employment business.”

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: Mr. Moderator

Cyr began a comment.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: Mr. Moderator

Moderator Flynn asked Geyerman if he had concluded his report.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: I have two or three more points and then I’m done.

Moderator Flynn noted the Senate had agreed to let him finish before responding.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: In conclusion, I would rather most definitely solve problems than complain. I think that academic integrity in athletics is the faculty business, and I think we have hit on a common ground. I, The promotion of athletics within academics is it. I think we’re also at a time, because we have a chance to re-define what the culture of the Senate is and it involving administration. When I go around campus and I ask colleagues that I think would be excellent Senators to run, many of them say they’re not interested. I asked them why? They say because all those people do over there is sit around and complain. For the last, I don’t know how many semesters, our Dean, and I don’t know about other Deans, has had to basically help in the recruiting effort because not enough people want to be on Faculty Senate. And I think that’s part of the problem. That’s my opinion. I, I, I think there’s a low opinion that **now in AA what I would suggest really for you, Marc, if you want all of information, is just to do a simple open records request for all of the correspondence that Georgia Southern sent to the NCAA and the NCAA sent to Georgia Southern, study it and make a report. That’s devoid of assumption and opinions. That concludes my opinions on the matter at hand.**

Moderator Flynn noted only six minutes remained in the scheduled meeting time unless the senate voted to extend, which he did not recommend.

[Secretary's Note: The recording becomes briefly inaudible at this point.]

Cyr noted that he had asked a lot of questions and Geyerman had engaged the questions. He said that he thought he and Geyerman would both invite others to get involved.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) FAR: I know I certainly would. I think one of the reasons that we have trouble getting folks drawn to run for Senate is they perceive like that we tend to talk and talk and talk about things that not everyone is interested in but one or two or three people. I believe in my opinion that's been one of our defining patterns over the last 8 or 10 years, and I think it's detrimental to us being productive, deliberative, policymaking body that rather than complain, I'm all for complaining, but I think it ought to end pretty quick. We ought to find an area and try to do something constructive and those complaints ought to lead to the recognition of a problem that we can agree on and work on and that we work collaboratively to provide recommendations to the administration that if not solved certainly lessen those problems and I know I would welcome personally as the Faculty Athletic Rep any kinds of such efforts on the part of the Senate and I will help in any way I can to facilitate those. I think my track record over the year has proven that.

Jim LoBue (COSM) thought a number of philosophical issues had been touched on regarding the role of the faculty in oversight beyond what the representative on the Faculty Athletic Committee does. He thought these were questions that we should have brought up as a body since we've moved up in football status: "What is the meaning of a student-athlete now? Has that changed? Or have we ever really debated what the meaning of a student-athlete is and what our role as a Faculty Senate or as a faculty in general should be?" He thought an open senate meeting was the wrong forum, and asked what the right one might be.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) FAR: Some ideas that I had just wandering through this off of the, about the 9E, because that really disturbed me, Marc. What's the role of the Senate appointee on the University Athletic Committee? There is one. It's in the Bylaws. It said is there something that Senate would like the Senate appointee on the University Athletic Committee to do? Is there something the Senate would like the FAR who right now happens to be me to do and include systematically in all of the reports that I make to the Senate? I would be more than happy to engage in conversations like that. But I do not believe it's productive to have situations where we have someone announce publicly I don't have a

problem with Chris, my problem is with Athletics, and maybe the NCAA, which is a verbatim quote from the email that Marc sent. I don't think that's productive to sit around and say I have problems so let me start bashing, bashing, bashing. I think it's productive to say if we have problems let's sit down and isolate some ways to that we can convert those into actionable items for the administration to take up. That is what I think shared governance is supposed to be. But I think we sit around and gripe too much. Way too much.

Alice Hall (CHHS) said she had been a member of the University Athletic Committee several times and applauded Geyerman for all of his hard work. She noted the composition of the committee and said that was the forum for these issues.

10. Announcements: Vice Presidents

None.

11. Announcements from the Floor

None.

12. Adjournment

Moved and Approved.

The next Senate meeting is scheduled for November 28th, 4-6 p.m. in the Russell Union Ballroom.

11-28-2016

11-28-2016 Faculty Senate Minutes

Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Georgia Southern University, "11-28-2016 Faculty Senate Minutes" (2016). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 29.
<http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/29>

This minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Faculty Senate Minutes
November 28, 2016
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Russell Union Ballroom

Voting members in attendance: Lisa Abbott, Sam Adeyeye, Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, Mete Akcaoglu, Kelly Berry, Sarah Bielski, Ted Brimeyer, Elizabeth Butterfield for Leticia McGrath, Chung-Yean Chian for Hsiang-Jui Kung, Gavin Colquitt, Finbarr Curtis, Marc Cyr, Lisa Denmark for Janice Steirn, Mark Edwards, Larisa Elisha, Richard Flynn, Jessica Garner for Lili Li, Tim Giles, Alice Hall, Ellen Hamilton, Ming Fang He, Jonathan Hilpert, Yi Hu, Alina Jacob, Scott Kersey, Eric Landers, Alisa Leckie, Jim LoBue, Lawrence Locker, Alan Mackelprang, Ron MacKinnon, Ed Mondor, Lowell Mooney, Constantin Ogloblin, Rob Pirro, Peter Rogers, Jake Simons, Fred Smith, Chasen Smith, Linda L. Thompson, Sam Todd, Mark Welford,

Voting members not in attendance: Cheryl Aasheim, Rocio Alba-Flores, Moya Alfonso, Dragos Amarie, Dustin Anderson, Adam Bossler, David Dudley, Eric Hall, Bob Jackson, Mujibur Khan, Barbara King, Li Ma, Santanu Majumdar, Valentin Soloiu, James Stephens, Tharanga Wickramarachchi, Meca Williams-Johnson Shijun Zheng

Senate Parliamentarian: Karen McCurdy

Student Government Association: Eudiah Ochieng

Administrators in Attendance: Jaimie Hebert, Jean Bartels, Diana Cone, Greg Evans, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker, Teresa Thompson, Rob Whitaker

Visitors: William Amponsah, Barry Balleck, Michelle Cawthorn, Richard Cleveland, Terri Flateby, Delena Bell Gatch, Candace Griffith, Steven Harper, Dylan John, Christine Ludowise, Roger Purcell, Brad Sturz, Ashley Walker

1. Approval of the Agenda for the November 28, 2016 meeting.

Moved and Approved.

2. Approval of the October 31, 2016 Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary.

Moved and Approved.

3. Librarian's Reports for November, 2016, Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Librarian

Moved and Approved.

Undergraduate Committee Report – Ron McKinnon (COBA), Chair

Emergency E-Mail Vote — a motion was made that in case of emergency the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee could have the ability to vote by email rather than scheduling an impromptu meeting. The motion was carried. **Program reviewers** — the Undergraduate Committee was informed by the Provost's office that Physics, Biology, Management, Finance, Graphic Design and Nursing programs are to be reviewed. The following members volunteered to do the program reviews: Gardiner, Khan, Hamilton, Tabi, Aasheim, Amarie, Leckie, and Hendrix. Under new business, College of Science and Math, Department of Geology and Geography, there were two new courses approved; two inactivated courses. Under the College of Health and Human Sciences, Department of Health and Kinesiology, there was one revised course. Under College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, Department of Communication Arts, there was a Selected Topics Announcement. Under other business, there was an update on the Curriculum Inventory Management (CIM). The committee's report was Moved and Approved.

Graduate Committee Report – Dustin Anderson, Chair/Richard Flynn (CLASS) presenting:

Anderson was in class, so Moderator Flynn, a member of the Graduate Committee, gave the report for October. The committee discussed two new business items and three old business items in addition to an update by the Registrar's office.

1. New Business:

- a. The committee approved two new courses in Geography. As part of that discussion, the committee established a practice for “rolling-back” proposals in the new Curriculum Inventory System. Based on feedback delivered during the meeting, the committee would “roll back” any unapproved items to the appropriate college’s Associate Dean.
 - b. The committee discussed the implications of making a change to the existing Graduate Faculty Status process mentioned in the previous month’s report. The committee approved the proposal from the VPAA’s office on retroactive conferral of this status on faculty who are already here.
2. Old Business:
- a. The committee continued the discussion of the change to Graduate Faculty Status forms and policy language. The committee approved the revision of the policy and companion form.
 - b. The Prior Learning Assessment sub-committee provided an update on the revision process of their proposal. The sub-committee would report back to the committee during the November meeting, which Flynn noted they did.
 - c. The committee continued its discussion of the delineation in degree descriptions. The committee asked for additional information from the colleges primarily affected by this delineation to be gathered for an upcoming meeting.

The report was Moved and Approved.

Core Curriculum and General Education Committee, Michelle Cawthorn (COSM), Chair Report

The main goal of the GECC this fall has been to review core course assessment reports. During September members of the committee reviewed the rubric used to review them and conducted rubric norming. During October the committee reviewed the reports. There are 73 core classes in areas A-E. The committee reviewed 61 reports. Some classes, such as for the Foreign Language reports, submitted one report for all the languages, which accounts for the discrepancy between the numbers. Each report was reviewed separately by two committee members; as much as possible, one person on the committee of reviewers was a member of the college in which the course is taught. After the independent reviews, the committee members met to reconcile their reviews. And

the colleges and core course report writers either had already received or will receive those reconciled reports. This was an information-only report.

4. President's Report: Jaimie Hebert

President Hebert started by apologizing for missing our last meeting – he was out of town – but he said he would be happy to address any questions from that meeting.

Fall Enrollment

We were up 1.07% for the fall, but a 2.2% increase in semester credit hour production. That is very solid growth because when semester credit hour production is increasing at a higher rate than headcount it is generally a sign that full time enrollments are replacing transient enrollments. In fact, we lost a great number of transient students over the year, and that offset some healthy growth in our graduate programs and our new freshman enrollment, so he was very happy and so was the System because it is a sign of academic health. The spring enrollments were currently slightly down, but he was not overly concerned about them because there were some anomalies in our enrollment data due to the changes in registration deadlines, and so forth, because of the hurricane.

Follow-up from Hurricane Matthew

He thanked faculty for the extraordinary job they did working with students, being flexible, and providing continuity through that trying time. We applied for an exemption to not have to make up those days we were out, and it was approved by USG, which was not the case with all universities, some of whom missed significantly more days than we did, but he saw this as a sign from the System that they trust the job that we are doing.

Board of Regents

Dr. Steve Wrigley has been appointed the new Chancellor, and Dr. Michael Crafton, who is currently serving as Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, will be returning to West Georgia, and they will be doing a national search for a Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at the System level.

Budget Meetings

Our budget meetings have typically occurred in December, but they're spreading them out over a large period of time. We are not scheduled for our budget hearing until March, but we are already turning in our budget information to the System. We will be

focusing completely on academics and on student success. In highlighting student success, we will be looking for funds to assist this primarily in Financial Aid. We are going to look at Graduate Education competitiveness—that's phase II of our stipend increases there. We are looking for faculty lines for growing areas and asking for help to address faculty salary compression. All of our major capital requests over the next several years will be focused on academic buildings. Some of our smaller capital requests are re: renovations of other buildings and support buildings on campus.

Reorganization

With the retirement of Vice President Salinda Arthur (Advancement and Alumni) he has eliminated that VP position and merged that office into our Government and External Relations division. Trip Addison will continue as the Vice President overseeing all four of those areas. His title will be [Vice President for University Advancement and External Affairs]. All staff will be retained. This move can streamline messaging and develop synergy amongst those groups. In addition, from Research and Economic Development, we will be moving Economic Development to VP Addison's area.

From within that division of Research and Economic Development, COGS has moved into Academic Affairs, which better aligns our Graduate School with our academic mission, and the remainder of the Research related activities, with the exception of Herty, will move into Academic Affairs as well. Dr. Don McLemore, who is currently serving as the Interim Vice President over that division, will now serve as the Director of the Herty Center. So we are essentially eliminating that Vice President position as well.

Steve Burrell was Vice President for Information Technology; he resigned in June. Ron Stalnaker will take over as Chief Information Officer, not a cabinet-level position. So this is another Vice President's position eliminated.

The Cabinet beginning in January will consist of four Vice Presidents – the Provost; the Chief Finance Officer; Student Affairs and Enrollment Management; and External Affairs and Economic Development. A smaller Cabinet will allow us to streamline our messaging and improve our communication, especially with some reorganization within the divisions. It also provides a significant cost savings by reducing administration, in excess of \$600,000, which we are going to reinvest primarily (meaning substantially) back into our primary mission, academics.

President Hebert called for questions, but there were none.

5. Provost's Report: Jean Bartels

Provost Bartels wanted to know why President Hebert didn't get any questions. When she was President, it seemed like there were a lot. She was just saying.

College of Graduate Studies

Re: COGS, there have been discussions with the Deans, chairs, program directors, and the Graduate Committee. The concern is making sure that COGS stays viable and active, and recognized as an important part of the University's body and life. Everything she had studied in the last year or so indicated that COGS mainly provides critical services. We have moved to having a Director of Graduate Studies and are about to launch a search for that position. The search will be for a faculty ranked person who has an understanding about graduate studies and will be able to oversee the organization and directing of graduate studies services. Under the graduate director will be an assistant, or administrative specialist in a number of areas, such as overseeing DegreeWorks and graduate clearances, looking at graduate assistants (who are under the purview of COGS), and looking at all of the admissions and administrative enrollment activities. We will not separate out recruitment and admissions; those are operating quite effectively and efficiently in COGS. But they will look at how COGS can support the recruitment activities that are happening at the program and college levels, because that's where the expertise and connections are, so resources will be committed to that end that were formerly under lots of people working in their separate arms of COGS. The Director search has been published; we hope to begin screening in January, with a job start time no later than July 1.

Research

We were still in the planning process for what will happen with the transfer of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs to Academic Affairs, set for January 1.

Lowell Mooney (COBA) asked whether Dr. Patterson would be coming back; if so, in what capacity; and what had happened with his position.

President Hebert said that Patterson was still serving as Interim President at another institution. If he returns, we will have a position for him, but it will not be as a Vice President. President Hebert had spoken with the System about this.

Barry Balleck (CLASS) noted a recent ruling by a federal judge in Texas about the Fair Labor Standards Act and that an injunction had been placed nationwide on the new

regulations. He asked if we were going to put a halt to any of the things that have been happening in the last couple of months, or were going to wait until this plays itself out.

Rob Whitaker (Vice President for Business and Finance) said we were told by the System office to continue with the way we have implemented the FLSA changes. They are consulting with the State Attorney General's office and once they have final rulings from them, then they will provide us the direction that we will head.

President Hebert went back to his previous comments to clarify that, re: Dr. Patterson, this was not a decision about him, but an organizational change needed by the University. He did a fine job for the University in his role with Research, and we will have a position available for him appropriate to the new structure.

6. Provost's Search

Teresa Thompson (Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management) said the Myers McRae Firm will be assisting with the search, but assist only, which means the committee will see all applications that come through the process. The committee will have an initial meeting likely January 18th or 19th; resume review will begin March 9th; Skype interviews sometime in March; and campus interviews in April. They were gathering information to prepare the ad that will go out to the *Chronicle* and other places, and also marketing materials that they will provide to the candidates.

7. Senate Executive Committee Report: Richard Flynn [CLASS], Chair

The Senate Executive Committee considered a number of requests for information and discussion items; he would explain why some were not on the agenda. They also discussed some further questions to the Athletics Representative. At the end of the last Senate meeting it was decided those questions were going to be directed to the Faculty Athletics Committee, so they had been forwarded to Ed Mondor to ask of the committee. They also had some concern about language in the *Faculty Handbook* about external review for tenure and promotion. They weren't certain that the language was clear and unambiguous about what sorts of things are supposed to be sent out for external review, for example, just scholarship, or also teaching and service. The Faculty Welfare Committee was charged to look at that language and figure out if they want to change or clarify anything; the SEC added some suggestions to that charge to the committee.

Discussion Item: [Student Ratings of Instruction](#)

This was not on the agenda because the chair of that committee has promised to come to the February Senate meeting, after the committee run their fall trial in face-to-face courses. They've only tested the instrument in online courses from the spring. They will also address any questions about this new instrument. No action will be taken on the SRIs at the February meeting so Senators will have the opportunity to tell them what they think, especially if they have experienced taking part in the pilot. Flynn assumed that the committee will make the instrument officially public before that meeting.

Request for Information: [Faculty input regarding activities in which the University expects them to participate.](#)

This was about the change of the graduation ceremony, which was already addressed at the last Senate meeting, but Moderator Flynn had passed on the written query in order to get a response in writing.

Unfinished Business

None

8. New Business

Election of Faculty Senate Moderator for the 2017-2018 academic year

Moderator Flynn announced that Robert Costomiris had nominated Robert Pirro for Senate Moderator, and he would give him a chance to speak for a couple of minutes. He asked if there were other nominations, but there were none, and his motion that nominations be closed was seconded and Approved. He then asked Pirro to speak.

Rob Pirro (CLASS) noted that he had been told the job of Moderator was a thankless one, so he wanted to explain why he wanted to do it anyway. From observing Faculty Senate Moderators, he had deduced that there are three aspects of the job: One is administrative housekeeping. The second is communication, sort of listening to faculty and administrators, responding to their concerns, modeling civility during the meetings, and so on. It is the third aspect of the job that attracted him – the Moderator as an advocate for the central importance of academics to this institution or to any university. He brought a perspective from his field of study, political theory, to the question of how

important academics are. The word and concept of “academics” originated with Plato and Socrates and involves examination of self, society, and nature; and looking for the better argument, interpretation, or analysis. That is what is important, and it is what we do, and he believed President Hebert had demonstrated a commitment to these ideals, and that encouraged Pirro to apply for the Moderator position, especially given that we will have a new Provost coming in. He thought it important for the Faculty Senate Moderator to advocate for the central importance of academics.

Pirro was elected by acclamation to be Moderator for 2017-2018.

9. RFI: Discussion of Curriculum Inventory Management (CIM): Velma Burden, Registrar

Registrar Burden noted that her report was mailed out to everyone on November 21st, that the CIM system was back up and live as of the 18th, and that there were several workshops that would be offered to give in depth training.

Moderator Flynn said he had a question about the workflow, noting he had a large number of emails in his inbox asking him to review and approve essentially every curriculum change that had been made so far by the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees. He said this was not an official way to do things; he couldn't approve them because they hadn't been passed by the Senate yet, and they also have to be approved by the President before he could do anything. He also said that reviewing every course change in the University is not in the Senate Moderator's job description. He asked Registrar Burden to address this situation.

Burden said that in collaboration with the Provost's Office they were working on streamlining workflow and considering returning to having approvals done from the minutes. Moderator Flynn thought that would be a big help.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) wondered why the workflow started with the Registrar's office before proceeding to Department Curriculum Committees, College Curriculum Committees, and University Curriculum Committees.

Burden said this allowed them to spot problems before it goes through to other steps. That is only a temporary phase which let them know they needed to take the system down and work with our CourseLeaf programmers to make things right.

Moderator Flynn asked about a backup system for when the system fails, as it had this semester.

Burden said they added a print button, so that if we should have an instance where the system goes down, people will still be able to use CIM to submit requests, then print them, and then follow the normal manual approval process that was previously in place.

10. Report and discussion of issues raised in Lisa Abbott's RFI on Student Employment: Rob Whitaker, Vice President for Business and Finance

VP Whitaker said the policy on student employment regarding students holding multiple jobs on campus has not been changed. No policy exists. We do have a 24 hour per week policy. That was the answer to the RFI.

The background is that we employ 2,316 institutional work study students. VP Whitaker thought we do a very good job of providing students with employment to help them financially. Of those 2,316, 745 are employed in the Auxiliary Services area. Of those 745, about 269 were not recording their time using a time clock. Auxiliary Services also employs 439 non-exempt staff who are a part of FLSA, and who were transitioned to reporting their time via a time clock. So the Auxiliary Services area made the decision to transition all of their "time clock or all their time stamping employees to a time clock requirement so they could be consistent across all 1,184 time recording employees within the department. The unintended consequence of that decision was that the ADP time clock system does not allow an employee to clock in at multiple locations, thus not having two jobs on campus if they are in a time clock situation somewhere else on campus." On September 15th the department met with the 269 students that were impacted by this, of whom 12 had a second job on campus. Of those 12, 3 left the Auxiliary Services area to go work at the other department on campus, 9 stayed within the Auxiliary Services area. Total, they received three complaints about this transition: Two of those involved community leaders who had work study issues, and both of those had been resolved; the one other student decided to work at the University Store.

The remedy: Auxiliary Services will put hiring procedures in place for the spring semester to avoid such disruption in student employment. He also noted that we are all transitioning from ADP to OneUSG. That new system will not have the same limitations about clocking in and out.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) thanked him for clarifying that it was an error in evaluating that the system coming in wouldn't work with the current system, and noted that 2 of the 12

students he listed were hers, which was why she was a little hot under the collar about this. She raised a related issue, “the failure of the professionalism on the part of HR” because “none of the supervisors, programs, departments, were contacted except for Auxiliary Services.” She only found out when she had students coming to her in tears because they had to quit their job with her. She said HR’s lack of communication was “a huge problem.” It took four emails before she got an answer from HR regarding her students, and if it weren’t that the Director of Theatre is married to the Manager of the University Store she would not have found out that one student was about to lose her job at the Store because HR had not removed her from Abbott’s ADP. Then they wanted a PAF. And they had never contacted her. She called this approach “disrespect to both the students and to their supervisors in their program” and said it was “offensive.”

VP Whitaker said Abbott’s “comments . . . are well taken,” but noted the decision was made in Auxiliary Services, not HR. He said he had taken note to make sure decisions are better communicated in future. He was confident that in HR things are being done properly, and that while Auxiliary Services need to communicate better with their students and with departments, he thought they had assumed that once they met with the students on September 15th that the students would talk to the departments, but obviously that didn’t happen very well.

Abbott thought it was a problem that they put it on the students. It put them in an incredibly awkward position, and they felt like they were failing the people in the Theater Department because they were told they had to quit.

Mark Edwards (COSM) asked for a timeline for transitioning away from ADP.

VP Whitaker said this was a System-driven decision to move from ADP to PeopleSoft. All he knew was that pilots will start in Spring 2017. There will be three pilots, and all we know is that we’re not in the last one. We expect it to impact us in the next fiscal year.

11. Discussion Item on QEP: Teresa Flateby, Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness will update and answer questions.

VP Flateby introduced her two assistant directors, who are also Associate Professors, and noted they would join in this discussion.

The QEP was developed about two and a half years ago with a team of faculty members, students, and administrators. The QEP is called *Georgia Southern! Eagles! Write! Write! Write!* The emphasis is on the development of students' analysis, argumentation, and synthesis skills communicated through writing: "So you could equally say that this is, think, think, think QEP as well." The plan is being phased in over five years. We started it in fall 2015 with fourteen programs in which a course was identified as a writing enriched course. There was already writing in these classes, but some changes were introduced by the faculty members. This year, we have those fourteen programs continuing with that initial course and they have identified a second writing enriched course. Over five years, the goal is to build to 60% of all programs in each college participating. We're in year two and have eleven new programs involved. Next year, the first group of programs will be offering three enriched courses. After five years three classes in each of the programs will be initiated. Two of the writing enriched courses are supposed to be sequential. Two are required. The third can be an elective.

Brad Sturz (Associate Professor of Psychology) said one activity is the involvement of "student writing fellows," mostly undergraduate students. Often, the student writing fellows can spend the time that we all would like to spend with our students, but can't, for example, seeing multiple drafts of a piece of writing before it is turned in for a grade.

Ashley Walker (Associate Professor, Community Health) said they also offer faculty development opportunities. For example, Michael Pemberton, Director of the Writing Center, offers sessions during the semester on writing instructions to make sure you are getting the product you want your students to be producing, since data showed faculty instructions and writing prompts were not always as clear as they thought. There's another on providing effective feedback without making it too time-consuming. There are also workshops in which faculty experienced in the QEP share their strategies with each other and with new faculty.

Sturz added that they hold a summer retreat that features an external speaker. There are also monthly meetings within each college. The goal is collaboration and sharing of what does and does not work. The ultimate goal is to change the culture at Georgia Southern University with respect to appreciation of writing and its importance.

Walker said they have an implementation team of faculty, students, and staff that is split into three subgroups: one looking at changing the culture of writing from a student perspective; one looking at how to involve the staff who work with students on a day-to-day basis to model good writing skills, such as good email composition; and one seeking

to incorporate other things on campus where students are using high-level thinking skills outside the classroom. There is also discussion of involving Residence Life in the process, maybe doing some writing workshops within the residence halls. One to-do item is to have the Writing Center open during all summer terms.

Sturz said a running theme through all of this is collecting information and identifying what resources individuals need to be successful in this implementation.

VP Flateby moved to indicators of change in students' writing. The QEP gathers data through the programs' annual assessment reports, which include QEP-related outcomes. One goal is the understanding that writing is a process, not an event, and they are trying to get students to use that process beyond just the classes that they are currently in. Almost all program reports have indicated that from the beginning assignment to the last, there were changes. They specifically mentioned students' facility in finding and using credible sources increasing over past students' performance. They also seem to have a better awareness of audience needs. As for writing being a process, when they first asked students why they were engaged in this, they said to improve their grades, but they're saying something a little bit more than that now.

Walker noted that she teaches these courses in rotation with Raymona Lawrence. One positive change is students coming to her office to ask specific questions. But they have found that students are still struggling with the synthesis of information and reading the peer review literature, so Lawrence created a new teaching strategy for students to analyze and synthesize articles and this created strong improvements; Walker planned to adapt the strategy and they would collect data on its efficacy and continue modifying approaches as directed by the data. Her students complain less because they know she expects a lot from them and they understand that, and because everything is related to their field of study and what they are going to be doing as practitioners. The biggest changes are with students who tend to struggle because she takes more time to walk them through this process. She and other colleagues have also noticed that the comments from the student ratings of instruction are more thoughtful – complete thoughts instead of little blurbs and bullet points; the same occurs on discussion boards. And in their writing there is less Wikipedia and more peer reviewed literature and websites.

Ellen Hamilton (CHHS) noted that faculty and student writing fellows do not edit students' papers; feedback helps them learn the process themselves.

Sturz noted that this term he implemented some QEP strategies in a non-QEP class, starting the first week on breaking the term paper down into subcomponents. He had one student tell him she'd been struggling, but then she presented her ideas to him in exactly the way we hope students will, and she thanked him for starting the process from the start of the semester. He had provided the steps to help her skills grow.

VP Flateby noted a University-level assessment process that includes the faculty member submitting the students' writing enriched papers to the office, where some are selected at random to be evaluated and scored by other QEP faculty during summer. They use a rubric that sometimes has to be adjusted depending upon the discipline. So far they have produced some discipline-specific data that shows students are improving re: revision, research, and thoughtfulness, but right now this really is baseline data.

Walker addressed the expansion and modification of the QEP implementation. They are trying to modify the initial written plan via information gathered from the college meetings and the course reports. For example, it is on this basis that plans have been made to keep the Writing Center open throughout the summer terms. This coming summer's retreat for QEP faculty may develop further modifications

Rob Pirro (CLASS) noted that many of his students complain they have too many papers due at the same time at the end of a term and so he sensed that they approach papers strategically, giving only some full effort depending on what grade they want in any specific course. He wanted to know if we considered it a success or failure that students can write A papers, but often write lesser quality papers because of the schedule.

VP Flateby noted that this QEP is focused on writing in the disciplines, so probably the writing in these particular courses is fairly important to the students. She also noted that these assignments are given throughout the term, so this is not necessarily a huge research paper at the end of a term. Many of these are called "writing to learn" assignments, so there's a lot more writing going on, but they may not be graded as heavily. All of this writing is in the discipline so they would be more interested in developing their writing and their thinking more than maybe in a course they're not as interested in.

Pirro noted that it had been said that their goal was 60% to begin with, and asked if we are looking for 100% participation in future.

VP Flateby said they'd love 100%, but the goal was 60%. They will continue to encourage more participation, and in some colleges it will be 100%.

Pirro asked for clarification that going from 60% to 100% would be through a voluntary process, and not through bureaucratic fiat. VP Flateby said, “Right.”

Announcements: Vice Presidents

None.

Announcements from the Floor

None.

Adjournment

Moved and Approved.

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate is February 7, 2017, 4-6 p.m. in the Russell Union Ballroom.